3 051 00231 3244

ST. THOMAS COLLEGE
LIBRARY
WITHDRAWN
UST
Libraries

American Historical Series

GENERAL EDITOR

CHARLES H. HASKINS

Professor of History in Harvard University

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/europesince18150000char

Erst wägen, dann wagen.

EUROPE SINCE 1815

BY

CHARLES DOWNER HAZEN
PROFESSOR OF HISTORY IN SMITH COLLEGE

WITH FOURTEEN COLORED MAPS

NEW YORK
HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY
1910

COPYRIGHT, 1910,
BY
HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY

THE QUINN & BODEN CO. PRESS
RAHWAY, N. J

D
350
H 336E
24p.2

PREFACE

The purpose of this book is the presentation of the history of Europe since the downfall of Napoleon. Needless to say, only the broader lines of the evolution of so crowded a century can be traced in a single volume. I have, moreover, omitted many subjects, frequently described, in order to give a fuller treatment to those which, in my opinion, are more important. I have endeavored to explain the internal development of the various nations, and their external relations in so far as these have been vital or deeply formative. I have also attempted to preserve a reasonable balance between the different periods of the century and to avoid the danger of over-emphasis.

The great tendencies of the century, the transference of power from oligarchies to democracies, the building up of nations like Germany and Italy and the Balkan states which was the product of long trains of causes, of sharp, decisive events, and of the potent activity of commanding personalities, the gradual expansion of Europe and its insistent and growing pressure upon the world outside, shown in so many ways and so strikingly in this age of imperialism and world-politics, the increasing consciousness in our day of the urgency of economic and social problems, all these and other tendencies will, I trust, emerge from the following pages, with clearness and in just proportion.

The problem of arranging material covering so many different countries and presenting such varieties of circumstance and condition is one of the greatest difficulty. It arises from the fact that Europe is only a geographical expression. The author is not writing the history of a single people but of a dozen different peoples, which, having much in common, are

(292

nevertheless very dissimilar in character, in problems, in stages of development, and in mental outlook. If he adopts the chronological order (and events certainly occurred in chronological sequence), if he attempts to keep the histories of a dozen different countries moving along together as they did in fact, he must pass continually from one to the other and his narrative inevitably becomes jerky, spasmodic, and confused. If on the other hand he takes each nation in turn, recounting its history from starting point to point of conclusion, he gains the great advantage of continuity, which begets understanding, but he writes a dozen histories, not one. He therefore compromises, perforce, with his intractable problem and works out a method of presentation of whose vulnerability he is probably quite as acutely conscious as any reader could be. My method has been to bring down more or less together the histories of those countries which have so intimately and significantly interacted upon each other, Austria, Prussia, France, and Italy, that the evolution of one cannot be, even approximately, understood apart from a knowledge of the current evolution of the others. I then return to my starting point, 1815, and trace the histories of England, Russia, Turkey and the lesser states separately, gaining the advantage of being able to show their continuous development. I hope that this method has at least the merit of rendering clearness of exposition possible.

My narrative is based to some extent upon an examination of the sources, although, considering the vast extent of the original material available, this has been necessarily comparatively limited. It is based chiefly, as probably any synthetic work covering so large a field must be, on the elaborate general histories of different periods or countries, on biographies, and on the special monographic literature. These are indicated in the bibliography at the end of the volume which I have attempted to make critical and descriptive rather than extensive. It has been impossible for me to employ footnotes freely and consequently I am restricted to

a general recognition of my great and constant indebtedness to the authorities used, a recognition which I wish to make as explicit and as grateful as it must be brief and comprehensive.

C. D. H.

NORTHAMPTON, MASSACHUSETTS,
December 31, 1909.

ti
em

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

PAGE

THE RECONSTRUCTION OF EUROPE

The Overthrow of Napoleon—The Great Coalition—The Problem of the Government of France—Treaty of Paris—Congress of Vienna—The Great Powers—The Division of the Spoils—Principle of Legitimacy—Demands of Russia—Demands of Prussia—The Fate of Poland and Saxony—Russian Acquisitions—Austrian Acquisitions—English Acquisitions—The Future of Italy—Italy a "Geographical Expression"—Criticism of the Congress—The Indignation of the Germans—Defiance of the Principle of Nationality—Denunciation of the Slave Trade—The "Hundred Days"—Second Treaty of Paris—The Holy Alliance—The Allies Promise Aid to Each Other—Unusual Character of the Alliance—Quadruple Alliance—Precautions Against France—The Concert of Powers—Quadruple Alliance and Metternich—Alexander I—Francis I of Austria—Metternich—His Diplomatic Skill—His Self-esteem—His Historical Importance—Doctrine of Immobility 1

CHAPTER II

REACTION IN AUSTRIA AND GERMANY

Lack of Unity in the Austrian Empire—Racial Differences—Not a German Empire—Policy of Francis I and Metternich—Austria a Land of the Old Régime—Local Government—The Police System—The System of Espionage—Application of the Metternich System in Other Countries—Germany a Loose Confederation—Varieties of States—The Diet—Its Powers not Defined—Germany not a Nation—The International Character of the Confederation—Dissatisfaction of the Germans with This System—Why the Problem of German Unity was so Difficult—The States-right Feeling—Dualism the Outcome of German Evolution—The Demand for Constitutional Government—Metternich's Successful Opposition—Various Forms of Government in the Different German States—Popular Sovereignty Nowhere Recognized—Constitutions Granted in Certain States—The King of Prussia Becomes Reactionary—Indignation of the Liberals—Ferment in the Universities—The Wartburg Festival—The Murder of Kotzebue—The Holy Alliance Converted into an Engine of Oppression—The Carlsbad Decrees—Provision Concerning Constitutional Government—Control of the Universities—Prohibition of Student Societies—The Censorship of the Press—Reaction the Order of the Day in Germany—The Persecution of Liberals—Prussia a Docile Follower of Austria 114

CHAPTER III

PAGE

REACTION AND REVOLUTION IN SPAIN AND ITALY

Spain—Spanish Constitution of 1812—Ferdinand VII, Abolition of the Constitution—Persecution of Liberals—Inefficiency of the Government—Disintegration of the Spanish Empire—Neglect of the Army and the Navy—Revolution of 1820-1823—Italy—Napoleon on Italian Unity—Significance of Napoleon's Activity in Italy—The Awakening of Italy—The Decision of the Congress of Vienna—The Ten Italian States—The Dominance of Austria—The Lombardo-Venetian Kingdom—The Kingdom of Sardinia—The States of the Church—The Kingdom of the Two Sicilies—Universal Reaction—The Carbonari—The Revolution of 1820 in Naples—The Powers Prepare to Suppress These Revolutions—The Doctrine of the Right of Intervention—The Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle, 1818—The Congress of Troppau, 1820—The Congress of Laibach, 1821—The Revolution in Piedmont—Reasons for the Failure of the Movements of 1820—The Congress of Verona, 1822—Reaction in Spain—The Triumph of the Holy Alliance—The Monroe Doctrine—The "Metternich System" Checked 45

CHAPTER IV

FRANCE UNDER THE RESTORATION

The Profound Effects of the French Revolution—The Restoration of the Bourbons not a Restoration of the Old Régime—The Constitutional Charter—The Form of Government—The Restricted Suffrage—Provisions Concerning Civil Rights—Recognition of the Work of the Revolution—Louis XVIII—The Difficulties of His Situation—The Ultras—The Center Parties—The White Terror—Louis XVIII Checks the Ultras—A Period of Moderate Liberalism—The Liberation of the Territory—Reorganization of the Army—The Electoral System—The Press Law of 1819—Activity of the Ultras—Election of Grégoire—Murder of the Duke of Berry—Electoral Law of 1820—The Double Vote—The Censorship Restored—French Invasion of Spain—Triumph of the Ultras—Death of Louis XVIII—Charles X—Policy of the New King—The Nobles Indemnified for Property Confiscated During the Revolution—Method of Paying the Indemnity—The Law Against Sacrilege—Clerical Reaction—Attempt to Re-establish the Principle of Primogeniture—Attempt to Destroy the Freedom of the Press—Disbandment of the National Guard—Attempt to Stamp Out the Opposition in Parliament—The Martignac Ministry—The Polignac Ministry—Widespread Opposition to the Ministry—Conflict Between Charles X and the Chamber of Deputies—The Ordinances of July—Charles X's Interpretation of the Charter—The King's Mistaken Judgment—The Opposition of the Liberal Editors of Paris—The July Revolution—The Character of the Fighting—The Ordinances Withdrawn—The Candidacy of Louis Philippe—Abdication of Charles X—Louis Philippe King—The End of the Restoration 66

CHAPTER V

REVOLUTIONS BEYOND FRANCE

PAGE

Wide-spread Influence of the July Revolution—Powerlessness of the Holy Alliance—The Congress of Vienna and the Kingdom of the Netherlands—A Union of Two Fundamentally Dissimilar Peoples—The Spirit of Nationality Awakened Among the Belgians—Difficulties in the Drafting of the Constitution—Friction Between the Belgians and the Dutch—The Influence of the July Revolution—The Belgians Declare Their Independence—Intervention of the Holy Allies Prevented by Events in Poland—Recognition of the Kingdom of Belgium—The Restoration of the Kingdom of Poland in 1815—Alexander I Grants a Constitution to Poland—Friction Between the Poles and the Russians—Influence of the July Revolution—The Polish Expectation of Foreign Aid Disappointed—The Failure of the Insurrection—Italy After the Revolutions of 1820—Revolutionary Movements in 1831—The Italians Receive No Help from France—Austrian Intervention—The Results of the Insurrections—Revolution in Germany—New Measures of Repression—Metternich Supreme in Germany 100

CHAPTER VI

THE REIGN OF LOUIS PHILIPPE

The Career of Louis Philippe—His Liberalism—His Legal Title to the Throne—The Constitution Revised—The Franchise Lowered—The Character of the July Monarchy—Insecurity of the New Régime—A Period of Storm and Stress—The Progressive Party—The Conservative Party—Popular Unrest—Casimir-Périer and the Policy of the Conservatives—Foreign Policy—Opposition Parties—The Legitimists—The Duchess of Berry—Republican Insurrections—Vigorous Measures of the Government—The Prosecution of Journalists—Attempts upon the Life of Louis Philippe—The September Laws, 1835—The Press Law—The Bonapartists—Louis Philippe and the Napoleonic Legend—Louis Napoleon Bonaparte—The Second Funeral of Napoleon I—The Boulogne Fiasco—Ministerial Instability—Rivalry of Thiers and Guizot—Louis Philippe Intends to Rule—Personal Government—Thiers and the Eastern Question—Resignation of Thiers—Guizot, Prime Minister—Guizot's Political Principles—The Government Scrupulously Parliamentary—How the Government Obtained Its Majorities—The Manipulation of the Voters—The Manipulation of the Deputies—The Servility of Parliament—Demand for Electoral and Parliamentary Reform—Rigid Opposition of the Guizot Ministry—Rise of Radicalism—Economic Distress—Introduction of the Factory System—Condition of the Working Classes—Growth of Socialism—Louis Blanc—Wide-spread Opposition to the Policy of the Government—Fusion of the Opposing Parties—The "Reform Banquets"—Emergence of Lamartine—The People Support the Demand for Reform—The Revolution of February, 1848—Resignation of Guizot—The Overthrow of Louis Philippe—The Rise of the Second Republic 114

CHAPTER VII

CENTRAL EUROPE BETWEEN TWO REVOLUTIONS

PAGE

The February Revolution a Signal for Other Revolutions—The General Character of the Period between 1830 and 1848—Evolution of Prussia—Great Intellectual Activity—The Achievement of Prussian Unity Imperative—Revision of the System of Taxation—The Question of the Tariff—The Zollverein—The Advantages of the Zollverein—Death of Frederick William III—Frederick William IV—The Demand for a Parliament—The Letter Patent of February 3, 1847—Popular Dissatisfaction—Conflict Between Frederick William IV and the United Landtag—Austria not a Homogeneous State—Political Stagnation—The Industrial Revolution—The Development of Nationalities Within the Empire—Bohemia—Hungary—The Hungarian Constitution—The Importance of the Nobility—The Prevalence of Feudalism—Széchenyi and Reform—The Policy of the Diet—The Language Question—Rise of a Radical Party—Louis Kossuth—The Demands of the Hungarians in 1847—Italy After 1831—Importance of a Group of Writers—Joseph Mazzini—His Intense Patriotism—His Imprisonment—Founder of "Young Italy"—The Methods of the Society—The Aims of the Society—Unity, a Practicable Ideal—Mazzini as a Conspirator—Gioberti—D'Azeglio—Balbo—The Risorgimento—Pius IX, Pope, 1846-1878—Charles Albert, King of Piedmont—Italy on the Brink of Revolution . . . 145

CHAPTER VIII

CENTRAL EUROPE IN REVOLT

The Great Mid-century Uprising—Vienna the Storm-center—The Decisive Intervention of Hungary—The Overthrow of Metternich—The March Laws—Hungary Practically Independent—Revolution in Bohemia—Revolution in the Austrian Provinces—Revolution in Lombardy-Venetia—Italy renounces Austrian Control—Revolution in Germany—The National Movement—The Parliament of Frankfort—The March Revolutions Everywhere Triumphant—Austria Begins the Work of Restoration—Bohemia Conquered—Italy Partially Conquered—Civil Dissension Within Hungary—The Croatians Rise Against the Magyars—Austria Exploits the Situation—Radical Party in Hungary Seizes Control—Abdication of the Emperor of Austria—Accession of Francis Joseph I—Hungary Declares Francis Joseph a Usurper—War Between Austria and Hungary—Hungarian Declaration of Independence, April 14, 1849—Hungary Conquered—The Conquest of Italy Completed—Abdication of Charles Albert—Overthrow of the Roman Republic—Fall of Venice—The Parliament of Frankfort—Leadership in Germany Offered to the King of Prussia—Rejection of the Work of the Frankfort Parliament—The "Humiliation of Olmütz"—Results of the Revolutions of 1848 169

CHAPTER IX

THE SECOND REPUBLIC AND THE FOUNDING OF THE SECOND EMPIRE

The French Revolution of 1848—Stages in the History of the Second Republic—Two Elements in the Provisional Government—

PAGE

The Republicans—The Socialists—Louis Blanc's Theories—Achievements of the Provisional Government—The Question of the Flag—The Labor Commission—Its Impotence—The National Workshops—Their Rapid Growth—The National Constituent Assembly—The Assembly Hostile to the Socialists—Abolition of the National Workshops—The June Days—A Military Dictatorship—Growing Opposition to the Republic—An Unpopular Financial Measure—The Framing of the Constitution—The Powers of the Executive—Discussion Concerning the Presidency—The President to be Chosen by Universal Suffrage—The Voters to be Untrammeled in Their Choice—Louis Napoleon Bonaparte's Opportunity—His Previous Career—A Member of the Constituent Assembly—A Candidate for the Presidency—Causes of His Triumph—Louis Napoleon Elected President, Dec. 10, 1848—The Legislative Assembly—President and Assembly Opposed to the Constitution—They Combine to Crush the Republicans—The Franchise Law of 1850—President Demands the Revision of the Constitution—The Coup d'Etat—Events of December 2d—The "Massacre of the Boulevards"—The Plébiscite—Napoleon III, Emperor, Dec. 2, 1852—The Programme of the New Emperor—The Political Institutions of the Empire—Parliament Carefully Muffled—Its Legislative Power Limited—The Senate—The Council of State—The Emperor—The Press Shackled—The Empire Both Repressive and Progressive—The Emperor's Activities—Economic Development—Paris Beautified—General Prosperity—The Congress of Paris, 1856—The Emperor's Policy of Peace—The Italian War of 1859 187

CHAPTER X

CAVOUR AND THE CREATION OF THE KINGDOM OF ITALY

Reaction in Italy After 1848—Victor Emmanuel II—Piedmont a Constitutional State—Count Cavour—His Interest in Political and Economic Questions—Becomes an Editor—Cavour Prime Minister, 1852—Policy of Economic Development—Cavour Seeks a Military Ally—Why Piedmont Participated in the Crimean War—Cavour at the Congress of Paris—Discussion of the Italian Question—Moral Victory for Cavour—Army Strengthened—Founding of the National Society—Cavour and Napoleon—The Interview of Plombières—A Conspiracy to Bring About a War—The Conditions Agreed upon—Difficulties and Dangers of Cavour's Position—Cavour's Diplomacy—The Austro-Sardinian War—The Campaign of 1859—The Preliminaries of Villafranca—Reasons for Napoleon's Action—Austria Eager for Peace—Resignation of Cavour—Piedmont Acquires Lombardy—Central Italy—Impossibility of Restoring the Old Order—England's Participation in Affairs—Cavour Returns to Office—Annexations to Piedmont—Cession of Savoy and Nice by the Treaty of Turin, March 24, 1860—Effect upon Napoleon III—The Sicilian Insurrection—Giuseppe Garibaldi—The Defense of Rome—Leader of "The Hunters of the Alps"—Determines to go to Sicily—Cavour's Dilemma—The Expedition of "The Thousand"—Conquest of the Kingdom of Naples—Garibaldi Plans to Attack Rome—Inter-

PAGE

vention of Piedmont—The Annexation of the Kingdom of Naples and of Umbria and the Marches—Siege of Gaeta—The Kingdom of Italy Proclaimed—The Kingdom Still Incomplete—The Question of Rome—Death of Cavour 215

CHAPTER XI

BISMARCK AND GERMAN UNITY

Reaction in Germany After 1849—Prussia a Constitutional but not a Parliamentary State—The Police System—Control of the Press—The Privileged Class—Economic Transformation—Industrial Development—Rise of a Wealthy Middle Class—Intellectual Activity—Influence of Events in Italy upon German Thought—The National Union—William I—The Prussian Army—The Obligatory Service not Enforced—Army Reform—Opposition of the Chamber—Determination of William I—Otto von Bismarck-Schönhausen—Bismarck's Previous Career—Bismarck's Political Opinions—His Attitude Toward Parliamentary Institutions—His Hatred of Democracy—Bismarck in the Diet—The Period of Conflict—Army Reform Carried Through—"Blood and Iron" Policy—Prussia's Three Wars—The Schleswig-Holstein Question—Action of Denmark Concerning Schleswig—Bismarck's Handling of the Question—Prussia and Austria at War with Denmark—Treaty of Vienna, Oct. 1864—The Future of the Duchies—Friction Between Prussia and Austria—Prussia Acquires Lauenburg by Purchase—The Meeting at Biarritz—Treaty of Alliance with Italy—Bismarck Prepares for a War with Austria—Bismarck Proposes a Reform of the Confederation—Prussia Withdraws from the Confederation—The Austro-Prussian War—Hellmuth von Moltke—Prussia Conquers North Germany—The Battle of Königgrätz or Sadowa—Causes of Austria's Defeat—Results of the Austro-Prussian War—Annexations to Prussia—The North German Confederation, 1867-1871—The Bundesrath—The Reichstag—Alliance with South German States—Consolidating the New System . . . 240

CHAPTER XII

THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE SECOND EMPIRE

Disastrous Effect of the Italian War upon Napoleon III—The War Approved only by the Democratic Party—Napoleon's Vacillation—England Offended—Treaty of Commerce Offends Protectionists—Napoleon Turns to the Liberals—Powers of Parliament Increased—Revival of Interest in Politics—Rise of a Republican Party—The Mexican Expedition—Napoleon's Purposes—Napoleon Overthrows the Mexican Republic—Disastrous Outcome of this Adventure—Intervention of the United States—Discomfiture of Napoleon III—Additional Concessions to Liberalism—The Right of Interpellation Granted—Dramatic Emergence of Léon Gambetta—Bitter Attacks upon Napoleon III—The Third Party—The Transformation of the Empire Completed—Popular Approval—The Plébiscite of May, 1870—Sudden Collapse of the Empire 272

CHAPTER XIII

PAGE

THE FRANCO-GERMAN WAR

Napoleon's Unwise Adherence to His Doctrine of Nationalities—The Meeting at Biarritz—Napoleon's Failure to Use His Opportunity in 1866—The Year 1866 a Turning Point in Modern History—"Revenge for Sadowa"—Failure of Napoleon's Diplomacy—Bismarck Regards a War with France as Inevitable—The Spanish Candidacy of Leopold of Hohenzollern—The Candidacy Withdrawn—Folly of the Duke of Gramont—The Ems Despatch—The War Party in Paris—France Declares War upon Prussia—South German States Join Prussia—France Isolated—The French Army—The Numerical Inferiority of the French—The Germans Invade France—The Battle of Sedan—The Fall of the Empire—The Government of National Defense—The Fall of Metz—The Siege of Paris—Election of a National Assembly—Thiers Chosen Chief of the Executive—Treaty of Frankfort—Fall of the Temporal Power—Completion of Italian Unification—Completion of German Unification 285

CHAPTER XIV

THE GERMAN EMPIRE

Growth of National Feeling in Germany Since 1815—Constitution of the New German Empire—The Emperor—The Bundesrath—The Reichstag—A Confederation of Monarchical States—Reign of Emperor William I—Bismarck's Commanding Position—A Religious Conflict—Causes of the Kulturkampf—Formation of the Center Party—Dogma of Papal Infallibility—The Old Catholics—The Falk Laws—Conflict of Church and State—Bismarck's Retreat—Financial and Industrial Questions—Adoption of the Policy of Protection—Its Advantage Proved by the History of Other Nations—Germany Should Imitate the United States—The System Gradually Applied—The Growth of Socialism—Alarm of the Ruling Classes—Attempts upon the Life of the Emperor—Severe Measures Against the Socialists—Their Failure—Continued Growth of the Socialist Party—The Imperial Government Undertakes Social Reform—Various Forms of Insurance Proposed—State Socialism—The Measures Carried—Bismarck a Pioneer—Not Supported by the Socialists—The Beginning of a Colonial Empire—A Result of the Adoption of the Policy of Protection—Energetic Intervention in Africa—The German Colonies—The Triple Alliance—Isolation of France—Austro-German Treaty of 1879—Entrance of Italy into the Alliance—Death of William I—Accession of William II—The Resignation of Bismarck—The Anti-Socialist Policy Abandoned—Remarkable Expansion of German Industry—Germany a Naval Power—Continued Growth of Socialism—The Social Democratic Party Numerically the Largest—The Demand for Electoral Reform—The Demand for Parliamentary Reform—The Demand for Ministerial Responsibility—The Present Situation 303

CHAPTER XV

PAGE

FRANCE UNDER THE THIRD REPUBLIC

The National Assembly—Paris and the Assembly Mutually Suspicious—Versailles Declared the Capital—Distress of the Working Classes—Revolutionary Elements—The Idea of the Commune—The National Guard—The Government of the Commune—The Commune and the National Assembly Clash—The Second Siege of Paris—The "Bloody Week"—The Government's Revenge—France at Peace—The Government of Thiers—The Rivet Law—The Cost of the "Terrible Year"—The Liberation of the Territory—Reform in Local Government—Army Reform—The Question of the Permanent Form of Government—Thiers and the Republic—The Monarchist Parties—Resignation of Thiers—The Count of Chambord—Establishment of the Septennate—Assembly Reluctant to Frame a Constitution—The Assembly Active Against Republicans—Growth of the Republican Party—The Constitution of 1875—The Senate—The President—The Ministry—France a Parliamentary Republic—Dissolution of the National Assembly—The Republic and the Church—MacMahon's Conception of the Presidency—Victory of the Republicans—Resignation of MacMahon—Grévy Chosen President—Republican Legislation—Creation of a National System of Education—Public Works—Revision of the Constitution—Colonial Policy—Increase of the National Debt—Death of Gambetta—Discontent with the Republic—Boulanger—The Republic Weathers the Crisis—The Dual Alliance—The Dreyfus Case—Dreyfus Degraded and Imprisoned—Picquart—Zola Attempts to Reopen the Case—Speech of Cavaignac, Minister of War—Court of Cassation Orders a Retrial of Dreyfus—Dreyfus Again Declared Guilty—Dreyfus Pardoned—Dreyfus Vindicated—Significance of the Case—Formation of the "Bloc"—Question of Church and State—Growth of Religious Orders—The Law of Associations—Religious Orders Forbidden to Engage in Teaching—The Concordat of 1801—Anti-clerical Legislation—The Clergy in the Dreyfus Affair—The Abrogation of the Concordat—Associations of Worship—Opposition of Pius X—Law of Jan. 2, 1907—Separation of Church and State—The French Colonial Empire—Algeria—Other African Conquests—Cochin-China—Expansion Under the the Third Republic—Western Africa—Madagascar 329

CHAPTER XVI

THE KINGDOM OF ITALY

Difficulties Confronting the New Kingdom—Piedmont Alone Accustomed to Constitutional Government—The Constitution—The Question of the Papacy—The Law of Papal Guarantees—The Curia Romana—The "Prisoner of the Vatican"—Death of Victor Emmanuel II—The Educational Problem—Extension of the Suffrage—The Triple Alliance—Francesco Crispi—Ambitious Military and Colonial Policy—The Resultant Distress—Policy of Repression—War with Abyssinia—Assassination of Humbert I—Victor Emmanuel III—Industrial Expansion—Advent of the Age of Electricity—Increase of the Population—Problem of Emigration—Italia Rediviva! 376

CHAPTER XVII

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY SINCE 1849

PAGE

Austria's Punishment of Hungary—Failure of the War in Italy—Francis Joseph Reverses His Policy—Federalism or Centralization?—Austria Becomes a Constitutional State—Hungary Refuses to Co-operate—Reasons for Her Refusal—The Hungarians Assert Their "Historic Rights"—And Demand the Restoration of Their Constitution—A Deadlock—Francis Joseph Yields—The Compromise of 1867—The Dual Monarchy—The Delegations—The Compromise Satisfactory Only to the Dominant Races—Constitution of Austria—Constitution of Hungary—The Dominant Races—Divisive Effect of the Principle of Nationality in Austria-Hungary—Austria Since 1867—Liberal Legislation—Demands of the Czechs—The Emperor Prepares to Concede Them—Opposition of Germans and Magyars—Triumph of Dualism—Electoral Reform—The Taaffe Ministry—The Slavs Favored—Growth of Radical Parties—Division Among the Czechs—Electoral Reform—Universal Suffrage—Hungary Since 1867—The Magyars—The Croatians—The Policy of Magyarization—Race Questions—Struggle over the Question of Language—Territorial Gains and Losses . . . 388

CHAPTER XVIII

ENGLAND TO THE REFORM BILL OF 1832

England in 1815—The Industrial Revolution—A New Motive Force—The Steam Engine—The Industrial Primacy of Great Britain—Advantages Derived from the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars—The Renown of Parliament—England a Land of the Old Régime—Commanding Position of the Nobility—The House of Commons—The System of Representation—The County Suffrage—Scotland—The Suffrage in Boroughs—Nomination Boroughs—Rotten Boroughs—Unrepresented Cities—Bribery—The Established Church—Dissenters—Abuses Within the Church—The People Neglected—Adam Smith—Jeremy Bentham—Effect of The French Revolution upon England—Economic Distress After 1815—Lack of Employment—The Demand for Reform—William Cobbett—Parliamentary Reform—Popular Disturbances—Suspension of Habeas Corpus—The Massacre of Peterloo—The Six Acts—Death of George III—The Dawn of an Era of Reform—Defiance of the Holy Alliance—Economic Reforms—The Penal Code—Reformed by Sir Robert Peel—Religious Inequality—The Religious Disabilities of Dissenters—Repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts—Catholic Disabilities—Catholic Emancipation—Daniel O'Connell—O'Connell Elected to Parliament—Emancipation Carried—The Restriction of the Suffrage in Ireland—Tory Opposition to the Reform of Parliament—Influence of the French Revolution of 1830—The Duke of Wellington on Reform—Fall of the Tory Ministry—The First Reform Bill—Provisions—Lord John Russell's Speech—Sir Robert Inglis's Speech—Representation Never Better—Hunt's Speech—Sir Robert Peel's Criticism—Macaulay on the Bill—Ministry Defeated, Parliament Dissolved—Second Reform Bill—Defeated by the House of Lords

PAGE

—Third Reform Bill—The Bill Passed—Redistribution of Seats —The County Franchise—The Borough Franchise—Not a Democratic Reform 406

CHAPTER XIX

ENGLAND BETWEEN TWO GREAT REFORMS (1832-1867)

An Era of Whig Government—Slavery in the Colonies—Abolition of Slavery—Child Labor—Previous Attacks Upon the System—The System Defended—The Factory Act, 1833—The Decay of Local Self-government—The Necessity for Reform—Municipal Governments Notoriously Corrupt—The Reform of Municipal Government—Accession of Queen Victoria—Her Political Education—Hanover—The Radicals and the Reform Bill—The Radicals Agitate for Further Reform—The People's Charter—Character of the Chartist Agitation—The Lack of Able Leadership—The Petition of 1848—The Significance of the Movement—England's Policy of Protection—The Corn Laws—Huskisson's Reforms—Sir Robert Peel's Ministry—The Anti-Corn-Law League —The Arguments for Free Trade—The Irish Famine—Repeal of the Corn Laws—Remaining Protective Duties Gradually Removed —Labor Legislation—Regulation of Labor in Mines—Factory Laws—Morley on the Labor Code—Growth of Trades-Unions—The Growth of Collectivism—Jews Admitted to the House of Commons—Gladstone Chancellor of the Exchequer—Postal Savings Banks—State Insurance—Industrial and Scientific Progress —The Demand for a Wider Suffrage—Effect of the Civil War—Gladstone Introduces a Reform Bill—The Bill Defeated—Reform Carried by Disraeli—Provisions of the Bill—Redistribution of Seats 439

CHAPTER XX

ENGLAND UNDER GLADSTONE AND DISRAELI

The Great Ministry—William Ewart Gladstone—Entrance into Parliament—Leader of the Liberal Party—Gladstone's First Ministry, 1868-1874—Dominance of Irish Questions—Ireland a Conquered Country—The Agrarian Question—The Religious Question—The Political Question—Catholic Emancipation —The Repeal Movement—The Irish Famine—Decline of the Population—The Fenian Movement—The Irish Church—The Tithe War—Disestablishment of the Irish Church—System of Land Tenure—The Land Owned by a Few—Tenants-at-will —No Compensation for Improvements—Industry and Thrift Penalized—Misery of the Peasantry—Deeds of Violence —The Ulster System—Land Act of 1870—The Bright Clauses—The Bill Denounced as Revolutionary—The Land Act a Disappointment—Its Principles Important—Educational Reform—Church Schools—The System Inadequate—The Question Becomes Urgent—The Forster Education Act of 1870—Church Schools Incorporated in the System—Board Schools Established—The Question of Religious Instruction—The Conscience Clause—The Cowper-Temple Amendment—Education Neither Free, nor Com-

PAGE

pulsory, nor Secular—Army Reform—Introduction of Short Service—Abolition of the Purchase System—Civil Service Reform—The Universities Thrown Open—Introduction of the Ballot—Reasons for Secret Voting—Gladstone's Waning Popularity—The Irish University Bill—The Religious Difficulty—General Dissatisfaction with the Bill—Unpopularity of Gladstone's Foreign Policy—The Alabama Award—The Elections of 1874—The Disraeli Ministry—Imperialism—Importance of the Colonies Emphasized—Purchase of the Suez Canal Shares—The Queen Proclaimed Empress of India—Re-opening of the Eastern Question—Fall of the Disraeli Ministry—The Second Gladstone Ministry, 1880-1885—Failure of Land Act of 1870—The Land Act of 1881—Rents to be Judicially Determined—Denounced as Confiscation of Property—The Reform Bill of 1884—The County Franchise Widened—Redistribution of Seats—Single Member Districts—Various Qualifications for Voting 465

CHAPTER XXI

ENGLAND SINCE 1886

The First Salisbury Administration—The Home Rule Movement—Charles Stuart Parnell—Adoption of the Policy of Obstruction—Gladstone Unable to Pacify Ireland—The Third Gladstone Ministry—The Home Rulers Hold the Balance of Power—Home Rule or Coercion?—Introduction of the Home Rule Bill—Shall the Irish Sit in Westminster?—Land Purchase Bill—Opposition to the Bills—The Union in Danger!—English Dislike of the Irish—John Bright's Opposition—Disruption of the Liberal Party—The Bill Defeated—The Conservatives Returned to Power—The Second Salisbury Ministry, 1886-1892—The Policy of Coercion—Land Purchase Act—County Government Reformed—Social Legislation—Increase of the Navy—The Fourth Gladstone Ministry, 1892-1894—The Second Home Rule Bill—Fundamental Objections—Bitterness of the Opposition—Passed by the Commons, Defeated by the Lords—Parish Councils Bill—Resignation of Gladstone—The Rosebery Ministry—The Conservatives Returned to Power—The Third Salisbury Ministry—War in South Africa—Irish Local Government Act—Death of Queen Victoria—Education Act of 1902—The Abolition of the School Boards—Decline of Illiteracy—The Liberal Party in Power—Old Age Pensions Law—An Irish University 497

CHAPTER XXII

THE BRITISH EMPIRE IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

The Expansion of Europe—The Growth of Colonial Empires—Vast Growth of the British Empire Since 1815—Overthrow of the Mahratta Confederacy—Annexation of the Punjab—The Indian Mutiny—Change in the Government of India—The Vast Population of India—The Population not Homogeneous—Annexation of Burma and Baluchistan—American Colonies—Upper and Lower Canada—Constitutional Difficulties in Upper Canada—In Lower Canada—The Colonists Desire Self-government—The Rebellion

PAGE

of 1837—Lord Durham's Report—The Executive Irresponsible—Durham Proposes Ministerial Responsibility—Durham Favors Federation—Ministerial Responsibility Finally Introduced—Founding of Dominion of Canada, 1867—British North America Act—The Dominion Parliament—Growth of the Dominion—The Canadian Pacific Railway—Australia—Early Explorations—The Voyages of Captain Cook—A Convict Colony—Abandoment of this System—The Discovery of Gold—The Six Australian Colonies—Reasons for Their Federation—Creation of the Australian Commonwealth—The Federal Parliament—New Zealand—Advanced Social Legislation—System of Taxation—Old Age Pensions—Africa—England Acquires Cape Colony—Friction with the Boers—The Great Trek—Founding of the Transvaal—The Transvaal Annexed to Great Britain—Majuba Hill—Policy of the Gladstone Administration—The Pretoria Convention—The London Convention—The Boers Desire Unqualified Independence—The Boers—The Uitlanders—The Jameson Raid—Sir Alfred Milner's Reports—The South African War—Victory of the English—Annexation of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State—The Union of South Africa, 1909—The Far Flung British Empire—The Problem of Imperial Federation—The Increasing Importance of the Question—The Difficulties in the Way—The Problem of Government—Commercial Union—Colonial Conferences—Confederations Within the Empire 518

CHAPTER XXIII

THE PARTITION OF AFRICA

The Period of Discovery—Situation in 1815—The French Conquest of Algeria—The Sources of the Nile—David Livingstone—Stanley—Stanley's Explorations of the Congo—Africa Appropriated by Europe—The Congo Free State—Its International Origin—The Berlin Conference—Leopold II and the Congo Free State—Criticism of Leopold's Administration—The Congo Free State Made a Colony of Belgium—Egypt—Mehemet Ali Founds a Semi-royal House—Ismail and the Rapid Growth of the Egyptian Debt—Intervention of England and France—Revolt of Arabi Pasha—English Expedition Crushes the Insurrection—England Assumes the Position of "Adviser"—The English "Occupation"—Loss of the Soudan—Death of Gordon—Recovery of the Soudan 550

CHAPTER XXIV

SPAIN AND PORTUGAL SINCE 1823

Spain—Revenge of Ferdinand VII after 1823—"Subversive" Cries—Loss of the American Colonies—The Question of the Succession—The Pragmatic Sanction—Isabella Proclaimed Queen—The Carlist War—The Royal Statute, 1834—Disturbed Political Life—The Constitution of 1837—Isabella II Declared of Age—The Mexican Expedition—The Overthrow of Isabella II—The Regency of Marshal Serrano—Amadeo of Savoy Chosen King—Abdication of Amadeo—The Establishment of the Republic—The

PAGE

Causes of Its Fall—Alfonso XII Recognized as King—The Constitution of 1876—Death of Alfonso XII—The Spanish-American War—Loss of Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines—Alfonso XIII Assumes Power—Portugal—Flight of the Royal Family to Brazil, 1807—Portuguese Revolution of 1820—Loss of Brazil—Donna Maria da Gloria—Death of Maria—Recent Events in Portugal 564

CHAPTER XXV

HOLLAND AND BELGIUM SINCE 1830

Holland—The Fundamental Law of 1815—The Constitution of 1848—Extension of the Franchise—The Dutch Colonies—Belgium—The Reign of Leopold I—The Reign of Leopold II—The Suffrage—Education 579

CHAPTER XXVI

SWITZERLAND

The Constitution of 1815—The Importance of the Cantons—The "Era of Regeneration"—The Sonderbund—The Constitution of 1848—The Federal Government—Powers of the Federal and Cantonal Government—The Chief Significance of Switzerland—Important Contributions to Democratic Government—The Landesgemeinde Cantons—The Referendum—The Initiative—Spread of the Referendum and the Initiative—Proportional Representation—The Population of Switzerland—The Neutrality of Switzerland 584

CHAPTER XXVII

THE SCANDINAVIAN STATES

Denmark Loses Norway—Consultative Assemblies—Constitution Granted—Schleswig-Holstein—Treaty of Vienna—Revision of the Constitution—Growth of Radicalism—Denmark's Colonies—Sweden and Norway—The Constitution of Eidsvold—Sweden and Norway Separate Nations Under the Same King—The Reign of Charles XIII—The Constitution of 1866—Friction Between Sweden and Norway—Abolition of Norwegian Nobility—Dissolution of the Union—Treaty of Carlstad—Death of Oscar II—Suffrage in Norway 592

CHAPTER XXVIII

THE DISRUPTION OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE AND THE RISE OF THE BALKAN STATES

Decay of the Ottoman Empire—Turkey in Process of Dismemberment—The Ruling Class—The Eastern Question—Treatment of Subject Peoples—The Revolt of the Servians—The Condition of the Greeks—Intellectual Revival—The Hetairia Philike—The Greek War of Independence—The Ferocity of the Conflict—Fac-

PAGE

tional Quarrels Among the Greeks—Foreign Intervention—Why England Intervened—Why Russia Intervened—Why France Intervened—Treaty of London—The Battle of Navarino—War Between Russia and Turkey—Creation of the Kingdom of Greece —The Principalities—Ambitions of Nicholas I—The Holy Places —War Between Russia and Turkey—Coalition Against Russia—Piedmont Joins the Coalition—Invasion of the Crimea—The Siege of Sebastopol—Fall of Sebastopol—Treaty of Paris—Turkey Admitted to the European Concert—Results of the Crimean War—Moldavia-Wallachia—The Roumanians and the Crimean War—The Union of the Principalities—Couza—Charles I of Roumania—Reopening of the Eastern Question—The Insurrection of Herzegovina—Accession of Abdul Hamid II —The Bulgarian Atrocities—Gladstone's Denunciation of the Turks—Servia and Montenegro Declare War—Russia Declares War—The Siege of Plevna—Treaty of San Stefano—Opposition to the Treaty—England Demands Its Revision—The Congress of Berlin—Independence of Montenegro, Servia, and Roumania—Union of the Two Bulgarias—Macedonia—Bulgaria since 1878—Alexander of Battenberg—Friction Between the Bulgarians and the Russians—Breach of the Treaty of Berlin—Servia Attacks Bulgaria, Nov. 1885—Abdication of Prince Alexander—Ferdinand of Saxe-Coburg—Dictatorship of Stambuloff—Murder of Stambuloff—Roumania and Servia since 1878—Roumania Proclaimed a Kingdom—Agrarian Disturbances—Greece since 1833 —Reign of Otto I—Overthrow of Otto—The Ionian Islands—Annexation of Thessaly—Aspirations of the Balkan States—Revolution in Turkey—The Young Turks—Revolution of July, 1908—Restoration of the Constitution—Apparent Unanimity of this Movement—A Modernized Turkey—Attitude of Foreign Powers—Austria-Hungary Annexes Bosnia and Herzegovina—Bulgaria Declares Her Independence—The Powers Do Not Prevent These Breaches of the Berlin Treaty—Servia—Opening of the Turkish Parliament—The Counter-revolution of April, 1909—The Young Turks Regain Control—Deposition of Abdul Hamid II—Accession of Mohammed V 601

CHAPTER XXIX

RUSSIA TO THE WAR WITH JAPAN

The Reign of Alexander I—Russian Conquests—The Nobility—The Peasantry—Alexander I—The Corruption of the Government—Poland—Alexander's Progressive Domestic Policy—Liberal Foreign Policy—Alexander Becomes Reactionary—Friction with the Poles—Death of Alexander I—The Reign of Nicholas I—Systematic Repression—The Police System—The Censorship—Safeguards Against the Ideas of Western Europe—A Brilliant Native Literature—Religious Persecution—The Evil of Serfdom —The Foreign Policy of Nicholas I—The Crimean War—The Humiliation of Russia—The Reign of Alexander II—Prevailing System of Land Tenure—The Mir—The Serfs—Serfdom Condemned—The Crown Serfs—The Edict of Emancipation—The Land Problem—Division of the Land—State Aid—Disappointment of the Peasantry—The Land Question not Solved—Establishment of the Zemstvos—Duties of the Zemstvos—Work

PAGE

Accomplished by the Zemstvos—Reform of the Judicial System —Educational Reform—End of the Era of Reform— The Polish Insurrection of 1863—The Aims of the Poles —The Poles Receive no Foreign Aid—The Deep-seated Divisions of the Poles—Russia Resolves to Crush the Polish Nobility—A Policy of Russification—Effect of Polish Insurrection upon Alexander II—Alexander's Policy Becomes Retrogressive—Widespread Disillusionment—Rise of Nihilism—Persecution of the Nihilists—Bakounine—Nihilist Propaganda—A Policy of Terrorism—Activity of the Police—Attempts upon the Emperor's Life —Alexander II and Loris Melikoff—Assassination of Alexander II—The Reign of Alexander III—Rigorous Policy of Reaction—Influence of Pobyedonostseff—Opposition to the Ideas of Western Europe—The Terrorists Hunted Down—Persecution of the Jews—Great Jewish Emigration—Progressive Features of the Reign of Alexander III—The Industrial Revolution—Sergius de Witte, Minister of Finance—Witte's Industrial Policy—Extensive Railway Construction—Rise of Labor Problems—Rise of a Rich Bourgeoisie—The System of Privilege Menaced—Accession of Nicholas II—Continuance of Autocratic Government— Increasing Disaffection—Wretched Condition of the Peasantry— Persecution of the "Intellectuals"—Attack upon the Finns— Abrogation of the Finnish Constitution—Despair of the Finns —Rise of the Far Eastern Question 645

CHAPTER XXX

THE FAR EAST

England, France, and Russia, in Asia—Russian Expansion—Russia Seeks Access to the Sea—Conquest of Turkestan—China—The Civilization of China—The Government of China—Isolation of China—The Opium War—The Treaty Ports—Entrance of Various Powers into Commercial Relations—Treaties of Tientsin—Russia Annexes the Maritime Province—Japan—Description of Japan—Japanese Civilization—The Mikado—The Shogun —The Daimios, the Samurai—Advent of Europeans—Japan Adopts a Policy of Isolation—Commodore Perry—Policy of Isolation Breaks Down—Overthrow of the Shogunate—The Mikado Recovers Power—Rapid Transformation of Japan—Abolition of the Old Régime—Adoption of European Institutions—Reform in Education—Japan Becomes a Constitutional State—Wars with China and Russia—Cause of the War with China—Treaty of Shimonoseki—Intervention of Russia, France, and Germany— Japan Relinquishes Port Arthur—Russian Entrance into Manchuria—German Aggression—Russia Secures Port Arthur—The "Boxer" Movement—Rescue of the Legations—Japan Indignant and Apprehensive—Russian Activity in Manchuria—Diplomatic Negotiations Concerning Manchuria—The Anglo-Japanese Treaty of 1902—Japan Makes War upon Russia—Russo-Japanese War, 1904-1905—Siege of Port Arthur—Mukden Captured by the Japanese—Destruction of the Russian Fleet, May 27th, 1905— The Treaty of Portsmouth—Reaction of These Events upon China—China in Process of Transformation—China Promised a Constitution 681

CHAPTER XXXI

PAGE

RUSSIA SINCE THE WAR WITH JAPAN

Unpopularity in Russia of the War with Japan—Open Expression of the Popular Discontent—Von Plehve's Iron Régime—Assassination of Von Plehve—A Russian Defense of Assassination—Nicholas II Enters upon a More Liberal Path—Demands of the Liberals—Not Granted by the Tsar—Widespread Disorder—The Tsar Announces His Intentions—Popular Dissatisfaction and Continuance of Disorder—The Manifesto of August 19, 1905—The Resort to the General Strike—The Manifesto of October, 1905—The Popular Demand for a Constituent Assembly Refused—The Government Makes Concessions to Finland—The Council of the Empire—The "Organic Laws"—Opening of the Duma, May 10, 1906—Demands of the Duma—The Impotence of the Duma—The Duma Dissolved—Stolypin Appointed Chief Minister—The Viborg Manifesto—The Second Duma—The Tsar Alters the Electoral System—The Third Duma—The Autocracy Asserts Its Supreme Authority—The Transformation of the Mir—The Restoration of the Liberties of Finland—The Finnish Parliament Altered—Renewed Troubles in Finland 706

CHAPTER XXXII

CERTAIN FEATURES OF MODERN PROGRESS

Literature—Music—Science—The Age of Steam—Rise of the Factory System—Steam Navigation—The Invention of the Railroad—Importance of Railroads—Electricity—Standard of Living—Popular Discontent—Spread of Militarism—Cost of Modern Instruments of War—Nicholas II and the Limitation of Armaments—The First Peace Conference at the Hague—Address of M. de Staal—Address of General von Schwarzhoff—Address of M. Bourgeois—Establishment of a Permanent Court of Arbitration—The Twentieth Century Opens with Wars—The Second Peace Conference at the Hague—Work of the Conference—Cost of the Policy of Blood and Iron—Significance of the Peace Conferences—Arbitration 719

BIBLIOGRAPHY 737
INDEX 773

LIST OF MAPS

	PAGE
Europe in 1815	*Frontispiece*
Distribution of Races in Austria-Hungary	25
The German Confederation, 1815-1866	31
Italy, 1815-1859	53
The Unification of Italy	237
The Growth of Prussia Since 1815	267
The German Empire	305
Colonial Possessions of the European Powers in 1815	523
Africa. European Possessions in 1884	555
Africa at the Present Time	561
The Rise of the Balkan States	625
Asia	703
Contemporary Europe	721
Colonial Possessions of the European Powers at the Present Time	733

NAPOLEON III, EMPEROR OF FRANCE


EUROPE
in 1815.
250
500
English Miles.
Greenland
Iceland
Arctic Circle
ARCTIC OCEAN
ATLANTIC OCEAN
NORTH SEA
BALTIC SEA
Norway
Sweden
Scotland
Ireland
BRITISH ISLES
England
DENMARK
NETHERLANDS
GERMAN CONFEDERATION
KINGDOM OF FRANCE
Bay of Biscay
SWITZERLAND
EMPIRE OF AUSTRIA
KINGDOM OF SARDINIA
PORTUGAL
SPAIN
MEDITERRANEAN SEA
Adriatic Sea
Tyrrhenian Sea
ALGERIA
MOROCCO
BARBARY
TRIPOLI
ITALY
Lisbon
Madrid
Barcelona
Valencia
Seville
Gibraltar
Algiers
Tunis
Malta
Naples
Sardinia
Corsica
Sicily
Paris
London
Vienna
Berlin
Petersburg
Stockholm
Copenhagen
West Longitude Greenwich East Longitude

Nova Zemla
Kara Sea
Waigach
Jugor Str.
Obdorsk
Obi R.
I. Kolguev
Kanin
Petchora
Samarovo
Tobolsk
Irtish R.
Lapland
White Sea
Archangel
Mesen R.
Onega
Dwina
Ural Mts.
Ekaterinburg
Issetsk
Ishim R.
Kem
Uleaborg
Onega L.
Petrosawodsk
Ladoga L.
Finland
Gulf of Finland
St. Petersburg
ESTHONIA
Wologda
Perm
Viatka
Vyatsk
Nijni Novgorod
Kazan
Volga R.
Yaroslav
Tver
Volga
Riga
Dunaburg
Dwina R.
Moscow
Simbirsk
Samara
Orenburg
Orsk
Turgai
Smolensk
Tula
Tambo
Saratov
Ural R.
Uralsk
Kirghiz Steppes
Kovno
Vilna
Minsk
Orel
Kursk
Penza
Orenburg
Gurev
Volhynia
Lublin
Berdichev
Kiev
Kharkov
Don R.
Sarepta
Volga
Astrakhan
Lemberg
Nicolaiev
Yagan roga
Sea of Azov
Mozdok
Stavropol
Alexandropol
Turkmenes
Caspian Sea
Bessarabia
Moldavia
Odessa
Kherson
Crimea
Sulina
Sevastopole
Tiflis
Georgia
Grusia
Kuro R.
Wallachia
Bucharest
Rustchuk
Varna
Black Sea
Bulgaria
Sofia
Adrianople
Constantinople
Bosporus
Rumelia
Armenia
Erzerum
Van
Tabriz
Chekishlyar
Asterabad
Mt. Demavend
Teheran
Kurdistan
Persia
Smyrna
Kaisarieh
Tigris R.
Mosul
Mesopotamia
Aleppo
Adana
Konieh
Ispahan
Antakieh
Bagdad
Euphrates R.
Cyprus
Rhodes
Candia
Crete
Beyrut
Damascus
Palestine
Jerusalem
Arabia
Bushire
Persian G.
Alexandria
Egypt
Cairo
30
40
50
60
70
80

The Battle of Magenta. 1859.

CHAPTER I

THE RECONSTRUCTION OF EUROPE

In March 1814, the enemies of Napoleon entered his capital and bivouacked in triumph in the streets. The long struggle was over which had forced the Emperor back step by step from the plains of Russia through Germany, and was now sweeping him from France. Slowly the states of Europe had come to see that Napoleonic domination could be ended only by a generous and unswerving co-operation. Reading this useful lesson in the defeats of many fields, they had built up the Great Coalition, and finally the political system, fashioned with such a varied display of talent by the Emperor of the French, had given way beneath the impact of a united and resolute Europe.

The overthrow of Napoleon.

But the overthrow of Napoleon brought with it one of the most complicated and difficult problems ever presented to statesmen and diplomatists. As all the nations of Europe had been profoundly affected by his enterprises, so all were profoundly affected by his fall. For nearly a quarter of a century the Continent had been harried by war, involving, directly or indirectly, all the powers, great and small. During that period boundaries had been changed and changed again with bewildering rapidity, old states had been destroyed, or cut up, or re-fashioned arbitrarily, several historic dynasties had been swept from their thrones, new legal and social systems had been established, largely after French models, and now the power that had led in this vast transformation had been humbled, its sovereign forced to strike arms. The destruction of the Napoleonic régime must be followed by the reconstruction of Europe, and it is with this difficult work that this history begins.

The Great Coalition.

This reconstruction was foreshadowed more or less clearly in the treaties concluded with each other by the various states as they entered the Great Coalition. Particularly important, however, were the Treaties of Paris and Vienna, to the making of which the powers now directed their attention.

The first step, naturally, was to determine the future status of France. What should be done with this arch-enemy of Europe, now that the decision no longer lay with her but with her conquerors? What should be her future government, how large her territory, how severe her punishment?

The problem of the government of France.

The question of the government was the first to arise, and had agitated the Allies for weeks before they entered Paris. There were several possible solutions. One was the continuance of Napoleon in power, but only after having given sufficient guarantees for good behavior. Such an outcome was possible up to the middle of March, when the conditions were presented him for the last time. After he rejected them the Allies determined to have done with him forever. There were the alternatives of a Regency for the little King of Rome, Napoleon's son, or of a successful French general as the new monarch, such as Bernadotte, now patronized by the Tsar. Some proposed to leave the whole matter to the French people, others to the determination of the legislative chambers sitting in Paris. But as the discussion went on it gradually became clearer and clearer that it must be either Napoleon or Louis XVIII, the founder of the new royal family or the representative of the old. Bernadotte upon the throne would mean an undue influence of Russia in the affairs of France; a Regency, an undue influence of Austria. An appeal to the French people, it was said, would let loose the Revolution once more, the very thing to which it was proposed to administer a definite and complete quietus. Gradually the cry of the French royalists in favor of Louis XVIII, "the legitimate king is

there," to restore him is imperatively necessary, "all else is intrigue," carried all before it, and the first step in the reconstruction of Europe was taken by the restoration of the Bourbons to the throne from which they had been absent twenty-two years.

Treaty of Paris.

On May 30, 1814, the Treaty of Paris was concluded between the Allies on the one hand, and France, under Louis XVIII, on the other. The boundaries of France were to be those of January 1, 1792, with slight additions toward the southeast in Savoy and in the north and northeast. On the other hand she was to relinquish all her conquests beyond that line, which meant the extensive territories of the Netherlands, Italy, and parts of Germany, containing in all a population of about thirty-two millions. The distribution of these territories was to be determined later, but it was already decided in principle, and so stated in the treaty, that the Netherlands should form a single state by the addition of the Belgian provinces to Holland, that Lombardy and Venetia should go to Austria, that the Republic of Genoa should be incorporated in Sardinia, that the states of Germany should be united in a federation, that England should keep Malta and certain French colonies, returning others, that the German territories on the left bank of the Rhine, united to France since 1792, should be used for the enlargement of Holland, and as compensation to Prussia and other German states, and that Italy, outside those regions that were to go to Austria, should be "composed of sovereign states." The definite elaboration of these intentions of the Allies was to be the work of a general international congress to be held, later in the year, in Vienna.

Congress of Vienna.

The Congress of Vienna (September 1814-June 1815) was one of the most important diplomatic gatherings in the history of Europe, by reason of the number, variety, and gravity of the questions presented and settled. The worldly brilliancy of its membership was remarkable even

for an age accustomed to the theatrical diplomacy of Napoleon. There had rarely been seen before such an assemblage as gathered in Vienna in the autumn of 1814. There were the emperors of Austria and Russia, the kings of Prussia, Bavaria, Würtemberg, Denmark, a multitude of lesser princes, and all the diplomats of Europe, of whom Metternich and Talleyrand were the most conspicuous. All the powers were represented except Turkey. So brilliant an array merited consideration, and partly because men needed relaxation after the tense and desperate years through which they had just passed, and partly to oil the wheels of diplomacy, the court of Austria was most profuse and ingenious in its entertainment. Gaiety was the order of the day. It has been estimated that this Congress cost Austria about sixteen million dollars, spent for pageantry and amusement, and this when the state was virtually bankrupt.

Slowly the work for which these men had come together was accomplished. The Congress of Vienna was not a congress in the ordinary meaning of the word. There was never any formal opening nor any general exchange of credentials. The representatives of the powers did not assemble day after day and deliberate upon the many problems pressing for solution. There were no general sessions of all the powers. A large number of treaties were made between the various states and these were brought together in their essential features in the so-called Final Act of June 9, 1815, a kind of codification of the work of the Congress. Everything was arranged outside in special committees, and in the intimate interviews of sovereigns and diplomats.

The Great Powers. Particularly important were the agreements of the Great Powers with each other, Russia, Prussia, Austria, and England, the Allies who had conquered Napoleon, for their decisions were the main work of the Congress, and were forced upon the lesser states, which were simply expected to accept what they could not themselves arrange. The dramatic interest of the Congress lies in the fact that these Great

Powers were not in harmony with each other, that their interests at times were so divergent, their ambitions so intense and conflicting, that at one moment war seemed likely to be the outcome of this meeting called to give peace to Europe.

The division of the spoils.

By the first Treaty of Paris of May 30, 1814, France had renounced all rights of sovereignty and protection over thirty-two millions of people. The diplomats of Vienna reserved the right to distribute these millions as they saw fit. This was the main work of the Congress as it was also the one which occasioned the greatest discord. The division of the spoils was a troublesome affair. The territories which France had renounced were widely scattered. They included what are now Belgium, certain Swiss cantons, large parts of Italy, extensive regions of Germany on both sides of the Rhine, and the Duchy of Warsaw, a creation of Napoleon out of former Poland. In addition to these, Saxony, an independent kingdom, which had remained faithful to Napoleon when the other German states had turned against him, and the Kingdom of Naples, of which Napoleon's brother-in-law, Murat, was still sovereign, were also considered properly at the disposal of the powers, by reason of their connection with the fallen star.

Certain questions had been decided in principle in the first Treaty of Paris, and needed now but to be carried out. The King of Piedmont, a refugee in his island of Sardinia during Napoleon's reign, was restored to his throne, and Genoa was given him that thus the state which borders France on the southeast might be the stronger to resist French aggression. Belgium, hitherto an Austrian possession, was annexed to Holland and to the House of Orange, now restored, that this state might be a barrier in the north. It was understood that, in general, the doctrine of legitimacy should be followed in determining the re-arrangement of Europe, that is, the principle that princes deprived of their thrones and driven from their states by Napoleon

Principle of legitimacy.

should receive them back again at the hands of collective Europe, though this principle was ignored whenever it so suited the interests of the Great Powers. Thus many of the German and Italian princes recovered their authority. But in the determination of the legitimacy of a government great elasticity prevailed. In general, those states which in Germany had been destroyed before 1803, and in Italy before 1798, were not restored. This alone meant that the map of Europe was far more simple than at the outbreak of the French Revolution.

Demands of Russia.

The Allies who had, after immense effort and sacrifice, overthrown Napoleon, felt that they should have their reward. The most powerful monarch at Vienna was Alexander I, Emperor of Russia, who, ever since Napoleon's disastrous invasion of Russia, had loomed large as a liberator of Europe. He now demanded that the Grand Duchy of Warsaw, whose government fell with Napoleon, be given to him. This state had been created out of Polish territories which Prussia and Austria had seized in the partitions of that country at the close of the eighteenth century. Alexander wished to unite them with a part of Poland that had fallen to Russia, thus largely to restore the old Polish kingdom and nationality to which he intended to give a parliament and a constitution. There was to be no incorporation of the restored kingdom in Russia, but the Russian emperor should be king of Poland. The union was to be merely personal.

Demands of Prussia.

Prussia was willing to give up her Polish provinces if only she could be indemnified elsewhere. She therefore fixed her attention upon the rich Kingdom of Saxony to the south, with the important cities of Dresden and Leipsic, as her compensation. To be sure there was a King of Saxony, and the doctrine of legitimacy would seem clearly to apply to him. But he had been faithful to his treaty obligations with Napoleon down to the battle of Leipsic, and thus, said Prussia, he had been a traitor to Germany,

and his state was lawful prize. Prussia preferred to receive her increase of territory in Saxony rather than in the west along the Rhine, because Saxony was contiguous. She would thus consolidate and become more compact, whereas any possession she might acquire along the Rhine would be cut off from the rest of the kingdom by intervening states, and would only render more straggling and exposed her boundaries, already unsatisfactory. Moreover, she wished no common boundary with France, feeling that she would always be weak along the Rhine.

The fate of Poland and Saxony.

Russia and Prussia supported each other's claims, the one to the Duchy of Warsaw, the other to the Kingdom of Saxony. But Austria and England were opposed to the demands of the northern courts, Austria not only because she was reluctant to give up her own Polish territory, her own part of the Duchy of Warsaw, but because she feared the power of Russia, and the growth of Prussia in northern and central Germany, England because she desired to prevent Russia from increasing in strength, and Prussia from threatening Hanover. The Polish and Saxon questions, thus closely connected with each other, formed the most thorny subject before the Congress, the very pivot on which everything turned. So heated did the discussion become that Talleyrand, utilizing the opposition of the Great Powers to each other, succeeded in forming a secret alliance between England, Austria, and France, to resist these pretentions by arms if necessary (January 1815). The situation into which the powers had come over this Polish-Saxon question was manifestly so full of danger for all concerned that they began to recede from their extreme positions. This prepared the way for concessions, but the concessions were forced largely from Prussia. The opposition to Russia was much less vehement, owing to her great military power. With three hundred thousand men ready for action she spoke with emphasis, and moreover, in the general state of exhaustion, Europe had no desire to go

to war on account of Poland. The final decision was that Russia should receive the lion's share of the Duchy of Warsaw, Prussia retaining only the province of Posen, and Cracow being erected into a free city; that the King of Saxony should be restored to his throne; that he should retain the important cities of Dresden and Leipsic, but should cede to Prussia about two-fifths of his kingdom; that, as further compensation, Prussia should receive extensive territories on both banks of the Rhine. Prussia also acquired Pomerania from Sweden, thus rounding out her coast line on the Baltic.

Russian acquisitions. Russia emerged from the Congress with a goodly number of additions. She retained Finland, conquered from Sweden during the late wars, and Bessarabia, snatched from the Turks; also Turkish territories in the southeast. But, most important of all, she had now succeeded in gaining most of the Grand Duchy of Warsaw. Russia now extended farther westward into Europe than ever, and could henceforth speak with greater weight in European affairs.

Austrian acquisitions. As Vienna was honored by being chosen the seat of the great Congress the House of Hapsburg profited greatly by the arrangements concluded there. Austria refused to take back her former possessions in southern Germany and Belgium, considering them too distant and too difficult to defend, and preferring to consolidate her power in southern and central Europe. She recovered her Polish possessions and received, as compensation for the Netherlands, northern Italy, to be henceforth known as the Lombardo-Venetian Kingdom, comprising the larger and richer part of the Po valley. The Illyrian provinces along the eastern coast of the Adriatic were erected into a kingdom and given to her. This enlargement of her coast line increased her importance as a maritime power. She also extended westward into the Tyrol and Salzburg, planting herself firmly upon the Alps. Thus, after twenty years of war, almost

uninterruptedly disastrous, she emerged with considerable accessions of strength, and with a population larger by four or five millions than she had possessed in 1792. She had obtained, in lieu of remote and unprofitable possessions, territories which augmented her power in central Europe, the immediate annexation of a part of Italy, and indirect control over the other Italian states. The policy followed by Austria in the negotiations was indicated by Metternich, who said, "We wished to establish our empire without there being any direct contact with France." This was accomplished.

English acquisitions.

England, the most persistent enemy of Napoleon, the builder of repeated coalitions, the pay-mistress of the Allies for many years, found her compensation in additions to her colonial empire. She retained much that she had conquered from France or from the allies or dependencies of France, particularly Holland. She occupied Heligoland in the North Sea, Malta and the Ionian Islands in the Mediterranean; Cape Colony in South Africa; Ceylon, Isle of France, Demerara, St. Lucia, Tobago, and Trinidad. It was partially in view of her colonial losses that Holland was indemnified by the annexation of Belgium on the Continent, as already stated.

The future of Italy.

Another question of great importance, decided at Vienna, was the disposition of Italy. The general principle of action had already been laid down in the Treaty of Paris, that Austria should receive compensation here for the Netherlands, and that the old dynasties should be restored. Austrian interests determined the territorial arrangements. Austria took possession, as has been said, of the richest and, in a military sense, the strongest provinces, Lombardy and Venetia, from which position she could easily dominate the peninsula, especially as the Duchy of Parma was given to Marie Louise, wife of Napoleon, and as princes connected with the Austrian imperial family were restored to their thrones in Modena and Tuscany. The Papal States

were also re-established. Austrian influence was henceforth substituted for French throughout the peninsula.

Italy a "geographical expression."

No union or federation of these states was effected, as in Germany, largely because Austria feared that she would not be allowed the presidency of two confederations. It was Metternich's desire that Italy should simply be a collection of independent states, should be only a "geographical expression." The doctrine of legitimacy, appealed to for the restoration of dynasties, was ignored by this congress of princes in the case of republics. "Republics are no longer fashionable," said the Tsar to a Genoese deputation which came to protest against this arrangement. Genoa and Venice were handed over to others. Romilly mentioned in the English House of Commons that the Corinthian horses which Napoleon had brought from St. Marks to Paris were restored to the Venetians, but that it was certainly a strange act of justice "to give them back their statues, but not to restore to them those far more valuable possessions, their territory and their republic," which had been wrested from them at the same time.

Other changes in the map of Europe, now made or ratified, were these: Norway was taken from Denmark and joined with Sweden: Switzerland was increased by the addition of three cantons which had recently been incorporated in France, thus making twenty-two cantons in all. The frontiers of Spain and Portugal were left untouched.

Criticism of the Congress.

Such were the territorial re-adjustments decreed by the Congress of Vienna, and which were destined to endure, with slight changes, for nearly fifty years. It is impossible to discover in these negotiations the operation of any lofty principle. Self-interest is the key to this welter of bargains and agreements. Not that these titled brokers neglected to attempt to convince Europe of the nobility of their endeavors. Great phrases, such as "the reconstruction of the social order," "the regeneration of the political system of Europe," a "durable peace based upon a just di-

vision of power," were used by the diplomats of Vienna in order to reassure the peoples of Europe, and to lend an air of dignity and elevation to this august assembly, but the peoples were not deceived. They saw the unedifying scramble of the conquerors for the spoils of victory. No ignominy was spared the people of Germany. The diplomats quarreled over the question whether some of the subjects of certain princes, who were not to be restored (the mediatized princes), subjects who paid small taxes, were to be reckoned as "whole souls," or "half souls." Germans were indignant as they saw themselves considered merely as numbers and articles of taxation. A German editor denounced this "heartless system of statistics," and glorious Blücher grimly compared this congress to the annual cattle fair. The doctrine of legitimacy was one of the rhetorical shibboleths, but, as already said, it was applied only capriciously as suited the Great Powers. Republics need not invoke it, and even kings were curtly excluded from its benefits. Gustavus IV, of Sweden, dethroned, claimed in vain his restoration. The King of Denmark was forced to acquiesce in the grievous dismemberment of his kingdom. For years the monarchs of Europe had denounced Napoleon for respecting neither the rights of princes nor those of peoples. They now paid him the flattery of hearty imitation. They ignored as cavalierly as he had done the prescriptive rights of rulers, whenever it seemed to them advantageous to do so. The principle of nationality which Napoleon had contemned to his own undoing, they treated with similar disdain. It was in defiance of this principle that Austria was given a commanding position in Italy, that Norway was handed from Denmark, whose language she spoke, to Sweden, as compensation for Finland, which the latter was forced to renounce to Russia, and for Pomerania, which she was forced to cede to Prussia, that the Belgians were united with the Dutch.

The indignation of the Germans.

Defiance of the principle of nationality.

Europe generally acquiesced willingly in the work of this Congress, ardently desirous as it was after the long, sickening wars, for peace at almost any price, and that work proved reasonably durable. Yet the settlement of Vienna had pronounced enemies from the start, anxious to overthrow it. Among the disaffected were the French, who saw what they regarded as their natural boundary taken from them. They alone, among the important nations, came forth from this international liquidation with no accessions of territory. Prussia, Russia, Austria, and England, all received additions and important ones. But not so France, and thus relatively to the others France was weakened. For Frenchmen these treaties of 1815 were "odious," and to be torn up when the propitious time should come. Multitudes, also, of Germans and Italians were embittered as they saw their hopes of unity and liberal government turn to ashes. The Belgians resented being handed about without even being consulted. They rose in revolt in 1830, and destroyed this artifice of 1815. The arrangements concerning Germany and Italy were demolished in the great decade of 1860 to 1870.

Denunciation of the slave trade.

Though the division of territories and the determination of the map of Europe constituted the main work of the Congress of Vienna, other subjects were passed upon as well. Though it did not abolish the slave trade, it condemned it in a solemn utterance "as contrary to the principles of civilization and human right." It was something to have the traffic thus officially branded. The Congress also established a federal form of government for Germany, which will be described in a succeeding chapter. It adopted certain articles concerning the future organization of Switzerland. The Final Act, codifying the work of the Congress during its many months of activity, was signed June 9, 1815, a few days only before the battle of Waterloo. All the governments of Europe accepted its provisions, except Spain and the Papacy, whose

opposition was treated by the others with easy-going indifference.

The "Hundred Days."

While the Congress of Vienna was slowly elaborating the system that should succeed the Napoleonic on the basis of a certain balance of power, Napoleon escaped from Elba, made straight for Paris, seized the government of France from the hands of the fleeing Louis XVIII, and entered upon a reign of a "Hundred Days." The Allies once more forgot their wranglings, indignantly gathered themselves together to end this menace once for all, and Waterloo was their reward. The sudden flash had, however, proved the necessity of legislation supplementary to that of the Congress before peace could be considered secure. The first Treaty of Paris had not proved a solid basis for a reconstructed Europe. A restored Bourbon had not been able to keep his throne. Now France must give sufficient bonds that in the future she would not disturb the tranquillity of the Continent. The result was the second Treaty of Paris (November 20, 1815), concluded, like the first, between Louis XVIII, restored once more, and the Allies, but unlike the first, imposing heavy and humiliating burdens upon France. Her territory was reduced, involving a loss of about half of a million inhabitants, though it was still larger than at the outbreak of the Revolution. She was forced to cede a number of strategic posts on her northern and eastern frontier. She was to pay a war indemnity of 700,000,000 francs and eighteen fortresses were to be occupied by 150,000 troops of the Allies for a maximum of five years, a minimum of three, these troops to be supported by the French. It has been estimated that the total cost of the "Hundred Days" to France, resulting from these stipulations and certain additional claims of the Allies, amounted in the end to 1,570,000,000 francs, the equivalent in purchasing power of about 6,000,000,000 francs to-day.

Second Treaty of Paris.

Before quitting Paris in the fall of this eventful year of 1815, the Allies signed two more documents of great

The Holy Alliance.

significance in the future history of Europe, that establishing the so-called Holy Alliance, and that establishing the Quadruple Alliance. The former proceeded from the initiative of Alexander I, of Russia, whose mood was now deeply religious under the influence of the tremendous events of recent years and the fall of Napoleon, which to his mind seemed the swift verdict of a higher power in human destinies. He himself had been freely praised as the White Angel, in contrast to the fallen Black Angel, and he had been called the Universal Saviour. He now submitted a document to his immediate allies, Prussia and Austria, which was famous for a generation, and which gave the popular name to the system of repression which was for many years followed by the powers that had conquered in the late campaign, a document unique in the history of diplomacy. Invoking the name of "the very holy and indivisible Trinity," these three monarchs, "in view of the great events which the last three years have brought to pass in Europe, and in view, especially, of the benefits which it has pleased Divine Providence to confer upon those states whose governments have placed their confidence and their hope in Him alone," having reached the profound conviction that the policy of the powers, in their mutual relations, ought to be guided by the "sublime truths taught by the eternal religion of God our Saviour" solemnly declare "their unchangeable determination to adopt no other rule of conduct, either in the government of their respective countries, or in their political relations with other governments than the precepts of that holy religion, the precepts of justice, charity, and peace"; solemnly declare, also, that those principles "far from being applicable exclusively to private life, ought on the contrary to control the resolutions of princes, and to guide their steps as the sole means of establishing human institutions, and of remedying their imperfections." Henceforth, accordingly, "conformably to the words of Holy Scripture" the three monarchs will con-

sider themselves as brothers and fellow citizens, "united by the bonds of a true and indissoluble fraternity," and will lend "aid and assistance to each other on all occasions and in all places, regarding themselves, in their relations to their subjects and to their armies, as fathers of families." Hence, their "sole principle of conduct" shall be that "of rendering mutual service and testifying by unceasing good will the mutual affection with which they should be animated. Considering themselves all as members of one great Christian nation, the three allied princes look upon themselves as delegates of Providence called upon to govern three branches of the same family," namely, Austria, Prussia, and Russia. "Their majesties recommend, therefore, to their peoples, as the sole means of enjoying that peace which springs from a good conscience and is alone enduring, to fortify themselves each day in the principles and practice of those duties which the Divine Saviour has taught to men." "All those powers who wish solemnly to make avowal" of these "sacred principles shall be received into this Holy Alliance with as much cordiality as affection." [1]

The Allies promise aid to each other.

This document, born of the religious emotionalism of the Tsar, has no parallel. Written in the form of a treaty, it imposes none of the practical obligations of a treaty, but is rather a confession of faith and purpose. Diplomatists were amazed at its unworldly character. Ultimately, nearly all the powers of Europe signed it, more out of compliment to the Tsar than from any intellectual sympathy. Metternich pronounced it a "sonorous nothing," a "philanthropic aspiration clothed in a religious garb," an "overflow of the pietistic feelings of the Emperor Alexander"; Castlereagh, a "piece of sublime mysticism and nonsense"; Gentz, a bit of "stage decoration." Yet for a generation this Holy Alliance or "diplomatic apocalypse" stood in the mind of the world as the synonym for the régime of

Unusual character of the Alliance.

[1] Extracts from University of Pennsylvania Translations and Reprints, Vol. I, No. 3. Edited by J. H. Robinson.

absolutism and repression which prevailed in Europe. But that régime was not the outcome of the treaty of the Holy Alliance, but rather that of the treaty of the Quadruple Alliance concluded in the same year. The former was a dead letter from the moment of issue, and did not influence the policy, either domestic or foreign, of any state. Its author, Alexander I, was, moreover, in 1815 a liberal in politics who had been largely instrumental in forcing the restored Bourbon, Louis XVIII, to grant a constitution to France, and who was himself about to grant one to Poland. He was certainly at this moment far from thinking of inaugurating a system of repression. But the latter, the treaty of the Quadruple Alliance, became under the manipulation of Metternich a stern and forbidding reality, as we shall see. The liberal newspapers of the Continent confused the two treaties, naturally enough, as Russia, Austria, and Prussia were signatories of both, and they came to speak with hatred of the Holy Alliance. The name excepted, however, the Holy Alliance is much less important than the Quadruple Alliance concluded November 20, 1815.

Quadruple Alliance.

Napoleon had been overthrown only by collective Europe, bound together in a great coalition. The episode of the "Hundred Days," occurring while the Congress of Vienna was laying the foundations of the new Europe, proved the necessity of the prolongation of that union. Hence, there appeared the "Concert of Powers," which for the next few years is the central fact in the international affairs of Europe. In the eyes of the victorious monarchs there were two dangers menacing the system they were resolved to restore: France as a military power; and "French ideas," the ideas of the Revolution, of the rights of peoples and individuals which, operating upon the masses of the different states, might lead them to attempt to remold the different governments along French lines. Against the first danger ample precautions had been taken. France was now surrounded by a ring of states sufficiently strong in

a military sense to hold her in check temporarily, and to prevent any such invasions of the French as had occurred during the previous years. Moreover, many of her frontier fortresses had been taken from her, leaving weak spots in her line of defense, particularly toward Germany. She had also been forced to consent to the occupation of her territory for several years by a large army under the command of the powers that had just humbled her. As if this were not enough, she was herself to pay for the support of those troops, and also to pay a large indemnity. It was believed that all this would be sufficient to compel her to keep the peace, that she would have domestic problems severe and exacting enough to absorb her entire attention.

Precautions against France.

The control or extinction of the so-called "French ideas" was a more baffling and subtle problem, but one which the Allies felt it necessary to attack. For this purpose they, Russia, Prussia, Austria, and England, signed a Treaty of Alliance on November 20, 1815, engaging to employ all their means to prevent the general tranquillity from being again disturbed, binding themselves "to maintain in full vigor, and should it be necessary, with the whole of their forces," the permanent exclusion of Napoleon and his family from the throne of France, promising to concert necessary measures "in case the same Revolutionary Principles, which upheld the last criminal usurpation," should again, "under other forms, convulse France." Expressing themselves as "uniformly disposed to adopt every salutary measure calculated to secure the tranquillity of Europe by maintaining the order of things re-established in France," they agreed, in order "to consolidate the connections, which at the present moment so closely unite the four Sovereigns for the happiness of the world," to renew their meetings "at fixed periods, either under the immediate auspices of the sovereigns themselves or by their respective ministers, for the purpose of consulting upon their interests, or for the consideration of the measures which,

The Concert of Powers.

at each of these periods, shall be considered the most salutary for the repose and prosperity of Nations and for the maintenance of the Peace of Europe." [1]

This was virtually an assertion that the four Great Powers would henceforth control Europe in the interests of the ideas they represented. The Alliance, whose object had been to overthrow Napoleon, was to be projected into the time of peace. There was thus started that series of congresses which, for the next eight years, exercised a rigid inquisition into the political movements of Europe, and a pitiless repression of such as appeared dangerous. This alliance was contracted with a view particularly to keeping France harmless. The important provision is that concerning future congresses, and it was the manipulation of these congresses in the interest of reaction, the conversion of this alliance into an engine of universal repression, largely by the adroit diplomacy of Metternich, that made the three powers which consistently co-operated, and had first signed the Treaty of the Holy Alliance, Russia, Prussia, and Austria, so odious to the Liberals of the Continent. In 1815 this Quadruple Alliance appeared as a warning only to France, but the first congress held under the agreement disclosed a compact union of the three eastern states against the spirit of reform everywhere. England's policy rapidly diverged, as we shall see, from that of her allies.

Quadruple Alliance and Metternich.

The fate of Europe in the period after 1815 was largely controlled by the powers that had thus proclaimed the principles of the Christian religion their favorite rule of conduct, yet the probable character of their policy could be more accurately foretold by a study of the character of their rulers rather than of the biblical principles to which they were amiably inclined to append their signatures. Each was an absolute monarch, recognizing no trammels

[1] Quotations are from Treaty of Alliance and Friendship. Signed Paris, November 20, 1815. Hertslet, Map of Europe by Treaty, I, 372-375.

upon his power, save such as he himself might be willing to concede. To each the fundamental idea of the Revolution, the sovereignty of the people, was incomprehensible and loathsome. Each had suffered repeatedly and grievously from that Revolution. Each was sure to be its enemy, should it break forth again. Yet there were variations. The Emperor of Russia, Alexander I, appeared, in 1815, the most powerful monarch of Europe. Young, imaginative, impressionable, he had received in his early education a tincture of western liberalism which, in the years immediately after Waterloo, seemed likely to deepen. This at first made Metternich regard him as little less than a Jacobin, all the more dangerous because crowned. Yet he was known as changeable, as egoistic, as influenced by fear. Frederick William III, King of Prussia, slow, timid, conceiving government in a parental, patriarchal sense, was a weak ruler, but a ruler whose views were those of the eighteenth century, who did not see the change that had come over the world, who was disposed to plod along contentedly in the traditional path of the absolute Prussian monarchy, distrusting innovations, deferential toward Austria. The other member of the Holy Alliance was Francis I, of Austria, the most narrow-minded, illiberal of the three. He, too, had learned nothing from the suggestive vicissitudes of his career. His mind was commonplace, barren, even mean. The spirit of his rule is mirrored in certain well-known utterances: "The whole world is mad and wants new constitutions." "Keep yourselves," he said to a group of professors in 1821, "to what is old, for that is good; if our ancestors have proved it to be good why should not we do as they did? New ideas are now coming forward of which I do not nor ever shall approve. Mistrust these ideas and keep to the positive. I have no need of learned men. I want faithful subjects. Be such: that is your duty. He who would serve me must do what I command. He who cannot do this, or who comes full of new ideas, may go his way. If he does not I shall send him."

Alexander I, 1777-1825.

Francis I of Austria, 1768-1835.

Though Francis I was a commonplace character he possessed in his chief minister, Prince Metternich, a man far out of the ordinary, a man who appeared to the generation that lived between 1815 and 1848 as the most commanding personality of Europe, whose importance is shown in the phrases, "era of Metternich," "system of Metternich." He was the central figure not only in Austrian and German politics, but in European diplomacy, dominating his age as Napoleon had dominated his, though by a very different process. Metternich was the most famous statesman Austria produced in the nineteenth century. A man of high rank, wealthy, polished, he was the prince of diplomatists "without a peer in his age or in his style," says a French historian and critic, "who deserved to govern Europe as long as Europe deserved to be governed by diplomacy. In this respect everything about him is interesting. . . . Metternich remains by exterior grace, by the excellence of tone, the perfection of attitude, and the subtle knowledge of the proprieties, an incomparable master. The great comedy of the world, the high intriguing of the European stage, has never had so fertile an author, an actor so consummate." [1]

Metternich, 1773-1859.

Metternich's reputation was based on his long and tortuous diplomatic duel with Napoleon. Claiming to have correctly read that bewildering personality from his earliest observation of him, and to have lured him slowly yet inevitably to his doom by playing skilfully upon his weaknesses, Metternich considered himself the conqueror of the conqueror. An achievement so notable imposed upon many, nor did Metternich do aught to dim the brilliancy of the exploit. His imperturbability, his prescience, his diplomatic dexterity were everywhere praised. He came to be considered the one great oracle, whose every word was full of meaning, if only you could get it. Diplomats bowed like acolytes before this master of their craft, and rulers also made their

His diplomatic skill.

[1] Sorel, Essais d'Histoire et de Critique, 21-22.

obeisance, though somewhat more slowly, as obviously befitted those who ruled by nothing less than divine right. A few years after 1815, Alexander I, of Russia, whose liberal vagaries had sorely tried this infallible high priest, made his penance. "You are not altered," he said, "I am. You have nothing to regret, but I have."

Metternich played this lofty rôle with becoming gravity and grandeur. His cynicism, so corroding for his contemporaries, never turned upon himself. Humility is hardly a proper weakness for a primate. No adulation could equal his own self-appreciation. He speaks of himself as being born "to prop up the decaying structure" of European society. He feels the world resting on his shoulders. "My position has this peculiarity," he says, "that all eyes, all expectations are directed to precisely that point where I happen to be." He asks the question: "Why, among so many million men, must I be the one to think when others do not think, to act when others do not act, and to write because others know not how." Traveling in Italy in 1817, he records: "My presence in Italy produces an incalculable effect." Traveling in Germany in 1818, he notes: "I came to Frankfort like the Messiah." Elsewhere he says: "Happy is he who can say of himself that he has never strayed from the path of eternal law. Such testimony, my conscience cannot refuse me." This superb presumption stood the test of all experience. Even in 1848, after the revolutions of Italy and Germany, the abdication of his emperor, and his own overthrow and flight to London, he said: "My mind has never entertained error."

His self-esteem.

As an historical figure Metternich's importance consists in his execration of the French Revolution. His life-long rôle was that of incessant, lynx-eyed opposition to everything comprehended in the word. He lavished upon it a wealth of metaphorical denunciation. It was "the disease which must be cured, the volcano which must be extinguished, the gangrene which must be burned out with the

His historical importance.

hot iron, the hydra with jaws open to swallow up the social order." He was the sworn enemy of the Revolution. He had a horror of parliaments and representative régimes. "France and England," he said, "may be considered as countries without a government." He defined himself as the man of the status quo. His was a doctrine of pure immobility. The new ideas ought never to have come into the world, but the past could not be helped. Prevention of the further spread of these new ideas was, he felt, the imperative requirement of European politics. He was the minister of European conservatism. His strength lay in the fact that repose was the passionate desire of the men of 1815. Nothing seemed more fearful to Europe than a recurrence of war. Only it was safe to say that a Europe, invigorated, electrified as this had been, however exhausted, however desirous of rest for the time, would not be willing to be forever quiescent. The ideal of immobility as a permanent thing is the paralysis of thought. Metternich failed in the end, though for a while Europe was blinded by his success, because, while he could imprison revolutionists, he could not imprison ideas. He failed to understand the impalpable forces of his age.

Doctrine of immobility.

Considering the work of the Congress of Vienna as largely his, his concrete task was, henceforth, to consolidate that work, to repel all attacks upon it. He saw only one side of the Revolution, the destructive. The constructive side he never understood. This, however, was for the future the more important. A comprehension of it was most essential for a statesman who felt the world resting on his shoulders.

How Metternich worked out his system will be seen in succeeding chapters. His lever was Austria. Austria's legal rights and commanding authority in Germany and Italy, and his own remarkable powers of persuasion, suggestion, and intimidation were the instruments used in the erection of the international fabric which took its name from him.

CHAPTER II

REACTION IN AUSTRIA AND GERMANY

Austria emerged from the Napoleonic wars stronger, larger, and more populous than ever. She had been repeatedly shattered, her boundaries repeatedly redefined during the last twenty years, yet the result was favorable. She had relinquished her possessions in the Netherlands (modern Belgium) and some of her southwest German lands, but had been indemnified by lands in Germany and Italy, which were contiguous and more advantageous. At the very moment that her great German rival, Prussia, was becoming more straggling and loosely extended, Austria was attaining a territorial compactness she had never known. Planted firmly upon the Alps and the Carpathians, and with an extensive coast line along the Adriatic, she was admirably situated for an assertive rôle in European politics.

Lack of unity in the Austrian Empire.

The Austrian Empire, however, presented to the eye certain peculiarities, offered by no other state in Europe, a knowledge of which is essential to an understanding of her history in the nineteenth century. The empire was conspicuously lacking in unity, political, racial, or social. It was not a single nation like France but was composed of many nations. To the west were the Austrian duchies, chiefly German, the ancient possessions of the House of Hapsburg; to the north Bohemia, an ancient kingdom acquired by the Hapsburgs in 1526; to the east the Kingdom of Hungary, occupying the immense plain of the middle Danube; to the south the Kingdom of Lombardy-Venetia, purely Italian. None of these even was a unit but each was composed of several parts. Bohemia included, beside Bohemia proper, Moravia and Silesia; Hungary included far to the

east the principality of Transylvania, and to the southwest the Kingdom of Croatia. Many of these constituent elements preserved special privileges, thus rendering the government confused and unequal.

Racial differences.

More important still was the fact that this empire was inhabited by many peoples which differed greatly in origin, in language, in history, in customs and institutions. At best these racial and linguistic differences rendered difficult, if not impossible, the growth of a national consciousness, a common patriotism; at the worst they might become mutually antagonistic and tend to disrupt the empire. The two leading races were the Germans, forming the body of the population in the Austrian duchies, and the Magyars, originally an Asiatic folk, encamped in the Danube valley since the ninth century, and forming the dominant people in Hungary. Yet also in the eastern part of Hungary were Roumanians, reputed descendants of early Roman colonists and speaking a language of Latin origin, and there were Slavic peoples north and south of the Germans and Magyars in both Austria and Hungary. In this medley of states, races, and languages there lay numberless possible causes of division and contention. They had almost nothing in common save allegiance to the emperor and, for most of them, to the Roman Catholic Church. If the desire for a separate national life should spring up among these various peoples, the Empire might be disrupted, would at any rate be transformed. In 1815, however, there was not the rivalry in nationality and language that has since become so acute.

Not a German Empire.

This empire was not a German empire, though it had the appearance of so being. The Germans were the most influential element, the ruling house was German, Vienna, the capital, was a German city, the German language was used for official intercourse. An attempt had been made in the eighteenth century, under Joseph II, thoroughly to Germanize the empire, but it had completely and quickly failed and it was not likely to be made again in the nineteenth century,

Longitude East 20 from Greenwich
Breslau
Prussian Silesia
Chemnitz
Thuringia
Plauen
Hof
Bayreuth
Würzburg
Nuremberg
Regensburg
Augsburg
Munich
Passau
Landshut
Linz
Danube
VIENNA
Pressburg
Prague
Pilsen
Budweis
Brünn
Olmütz
Trentschin
Gran
Schemnitz
Neusiedler
Oedenburg
Raab
Budapest
Stuhlweissenburg
Steinamanger
Vezsprim
Kecskemet
Kalocsa
Szegedin
Ma Theresiopel
Zenta
Debreczen
Grosswardein
Klausenburg
Bistritz
Arad
Temesvár
Lugos
Hermannstadt
Fogaras
Kronstadt
Maros Vásárhely
Szeklers
Transylvania
Saxons
Banat
Versecz
Mehadia
Orsova
Belgrade
Roumania
Bukharest
Ploesti
Pitesti
Rimnicu
Czernowitz
Bukovina
Sereth
Pruth
Dniester
Munkacz
Eperies
Kaschau
Zips
Tarnow
Cracow
Lemberg
Galicia
Krementz
Jaroslau
Przemysl
Sanok
Tarnopol
Brody
Austria
Moravia
Bohemia
Saxony
Würtemberg
Bavaria
Upper Austria
Salzburg
Styria
Carinthia
Tyrol
Vorarlberg
Innsbruck
Salzburg
Klagenfurt
Villach
Marburg
Graz
Brixen
Trent
Belluno
Udine
Gradisca
Laibach
Carniola
Trieste
Gulf of Venice
Venice
Verona
Padua
Brescia
Mantua
Milan
Po
Parma
Bologna
Pisa
Florence
Arno R.
Leghorn
Perugia
Adriatic Sea
Italy
Croatia
Slavonia
Fiume
Agram
Karlstadt
Essek
Peterwardein
Syrmia
Neusatz
Brod
Zengg
Bosna
Banialuka
Bosnia
Dalmatia
Zara
Spalato
Lissa
Lesina
Curzola
Ragusa
Herzegovina
Mostar
Saraievo
Cattaro
Scutari
Montenegro
Servia
Nissa
Nisvipazar
Prizren
Turkey
Danube
Drina
Morawa
Ibar
Save
Theiss
Maros
Temes
Danube
Germans
Czechs
Slovaks
Poles
Ruthenians
Slovenes
Serbo-Croats
Italians & Ladines
Roumanians
Magyars.
DISTRIBUTION OF RACES IN AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.
0 62.5 125
English Miles

as the balance between the German and the non-German elements had been altered since, considerably in favor of the latter. The Germans were in a decided numerical minority, but by reason of their greater wealth, intelligence, and general advancement they remained the leading element in the state. But the nineteenth century was to see their leadership contested and gradually weakened by the rise of strong national and race movements in Hungary and Bohemia. The Slavs formed the majority of the population of the entire empire, but they were not homogeneous, were geographically scattered, were in civilization inferior, and were for the time quiescent.

Policy of Francis I and Metternich.

To rule so conglomerate a realm of twenty-eight or twenty-nine million people was a task of great difficulty. This was the first problem of Francis I (1792-1835) and Metternich. Their policy in the main was to keep things as they were. To innovate was to enter a lane that might know no turning. They made no attempt to reform the government. They allowed the various parts of the political machine to continue, lacking as it was in symmetry and in efficiency. This machinery was both chaotic and unscientific. There was no central, coherent cabinet, or group of ministers. There were, of course, various departments, but some had jurisdiction over the whole empire, some only over parts. In any case the boundaries were not carefully defined. Government was exceedingly slow, cumbrous, disjointed, inefficient.

Austria a land of the Old Régime.

Austria was now the classic land of the old régime. Her boundaries had been repeatedly changed at the hands of Napoleon, but the internal structure of the state and of society had remained unaltered. The people were sharply divided into classes, each resting on a different legal basis. Of these the nobility occupied a highly privileged position. They enjoyed freedom from compulsory military service, large exemptions from taxation, a practical monopoly of the best offices in the state. They possessed a large part of the

land, from which in many cases they drew enormous revenues. Upon their estates they exercised many of the same feudal rights as had their ancestors, such as those of the police power and of administering justice through their own courts. They exacted the *corvée* and other services from the peasants. The condition of the peasants, indeed, who formed the immense mass of the population, was deplorable. It has been stated that in Bohemia, for instance, they owed half of their time and two-thirds of their crops to the lords, and in certain parts it was not uncommon for human beings and cattle to be sheltered by the same roof. The peasants had indeed been refused the right to purchase release from their heaviest burdens. These were the two classes into which Austrian society was divided, for the bourgeoisie, or middle class, was only slightly developed and of little importance. Industry was in a backward state, hampered at every point by official regulations.

Local government.

There were throughout the empire various local bodies called estates, which, however, constituted no real check upon the absolutism of the central government. They in no sense constituted local self-government. They were composed almost entirely of nobles, and their powers were slight. Their sessions were brief, perfunctory, and furnished no political training. Hungary occupied a somewhat special position. She had a central diet or parliament and long-established county governments. They, however, were no great barrier to the working of the central government, which, indeed, for thirteen years, from 1812 to 1825, refused in spite of the law to call the Diet together. Moreover, these Hungarian assemblies did not represent the Hungarian people but merely the privileged classes. Absolutism in government, feudalism in society, special privileges for the favored few, oppression and misery for the masses, such was the condition of Austria in 1815.

The police system.

It was the fixed purpose of the Government to maintain things as they were and it succeeded largely for thirty-three

years, during the reign of Francis I, till 1835, and of his successor, Ferdinand I (1835-48.) During all this period Metternich was the chief minister, the accomplished and resourceful representative of the status quo. His system, at war with human nature, at war with the modern spirit, rested upon a meddlesome and ubiquitous police, upon elaborate espionage, upon a vigilant censorship of ideas. The head of this department boasted that he had " perfected " the system of Fouché, an achievement similar to that of painting the lily. Censorship was applied to theaters, newspapers, books. The frontiers were guarded that foreign books of a liberal character might not slip in to corrupt. Political science and history practically disappeared as serious studies. Spies were everywhere, in government offices, in places of amusement, in educational institutions. Particularly did this Government fear the universities, because it feared ideas. Professors and students were subjected to humiliating regulations. Spies attended lectures. The Government insisted on having a complete list of the books that each professor took out of the university library. Text-books were prescribed. Foreign scholars might not be appointed to professional positions, nor even become tutors in private families. Students might not study in foreign universities, nor might they have societies of their own. A clerical inquisition was added to that of the police. Students must attend church and go to confession at stated times. Confession papers were required at all examinations. Confession became a regular business for poor students, who sold their papers to comrades needing them on such occasions. As examination periods approached such papers rose and fell according to supply and demand, like stocks and bonds. Obviously, under a system where there was no freedom of teaching or of learning, science withered. It was accordingly perfectly appropriate for a friend of Metternich to congratulate him on the entire exclusion of the scientific spirit from the universities of Austria. Austrians might not travel to foreign

The system of espionage.

countries without the permission of the Government, which was rarely given. Austria was sealed as nearly hermetically as possible against the liberal thought of Europe. Intellectual stagnation was the price paid. A system like this needed careful bolstering at every moment and at every point. The best protection for the Austrian system was to extend it to other countries. Having firmly established it at home, Metternich labored with great skill and temporary success to apply it in surrounding countries, in Germany through the Diet and the state governments, in Italy through interventions and treaties, binding Italian states not to follow policies opposed to the Austrian, and in general by bringing about a close accord of the Great Powers on this illiberal basis.

Application of the Metternich system in other countries.

We shall now trace the application of this conception of government in other countries. This will serve among other things to show the dominant position of the Danubian empire in Europe from 1815 to 1848. Vienna, the seat of rigid conservatism, was now the center of European affairs, as Paris, the home of revolution, had been for so long.

GERMANY

Germany a loose confederation.

One of the most remarkable changes of the nineteenth century has been the transformation of Germany, from a loose and inefficient federation into an imposing, powerful empire. Germany, like Italy, was long a geographical expression rather than a nation. The map of Germany was for centuries the wonder of the world. It was a tangle of lilliputian and irrational states, many of them "archeological curiosities." Since the outbreak of the Revolutionary Wars these had disappeared in large numbers, greedily absorbed by their more powerful neighbors. Thus the knights of the empire, the ecclesiastical states, and nearly all the free cities, had disappeared, so that between 1798 and 1815 the number of German states had decreased to less than forty. This work of simplification had been largely

furthered by the spirit of aggrandizement of the German princes themselves, who were anxious to increase their dominions, no matter by what means, and who eagerly co-operated with Napoleon, the purpose of whose manipulations was not the welfare of Germany. The German states of 1815 were of all shapes and sizes and of various denominations. There were free cities, electorates, margravates, duchies, grand duchies, and five kingdoms, Prussia, Hanover, Saxony, Würtemberg, and Bavaria. The last three had been raised to regal rank by the all-powerful Napoleon, and at his fall it was found impossible to reduce to duchies again what he had so greatly exalted.

Varieties of states.

Down to 1806 the German states had been bound together in a loose union called the Holy Roman Empire, about which clustered the brilliant, but rather airy, unsubstantial memories of centuries. That had been succeeded from 1806 to 1813 by the Confederation of the Rhine, a creation and instrument of Napoleon, which included ultimately nearly all Germany except the two great states, Prussia and Austria. This confederation fell with its creator and the question of the future organization was one much discussed at the Congress of Vienna and settled there, not by the restoration of the Holy Roman Empire, which many advocated, but by the erection of the so-called German Confederation, composed of thirty-eight states.[1] The central organ of the government was to be a Diet, meeting at Frankfort. This was to consist not at all of representatives chosen by the people, but of delegates appointed by the different sovereigns and serving during their pleasure. They were to be not deputies empowered to decide questions, but simply diplomatic representatives, voting as their princes might direct. Austria was always to have the presidency of this body. The method of procedure within the Diet was complicated and exceed-

The Diet.

[1] Made 39 by the admission of Hesse-Homburg in 1817, remaining such only until 1825, when the line of Saxe-Gotha died out. Reduced by subsequent extinction of other houses to 33 before its dissolution in 1866.

ingly cumbrous. It sat sometimes as an Ordinary Assembly, sometimes as a General Assembly or Plenum. The difference was mainly in the character of the business transacted, and in the method of voting. In the former only ordinary business was considered and matters were decided by a majority vote. Each of the eleven large states had one vote, while the remaining states were divided into six groups, called curiæ, each group having a single vote. There were thus seventeen votes in all. In the Plenum were considered all questions of greater importance. Here a two-thirds vote was necessary for a decision. The total number of votes was sixty-nine, divided among the different states. Austria, Prussia, Saxony, Bavaria, Hanover, and Würtemberg, had four each, others three, two, and each state had at least one. The distribution was grossly unfair if it was intended to show the relative importance of the several states. Prussia and Austria, great European powers, had no more weight than Saxony, a small state, and only four times as much as Liechtenstein, a state of a few thousand inhabitants. Thus it came about that the seven larger states, having five-sixths of the population of Germany, could be outvoted decisively by the smaller states representing one-sixth.

Its powers not defined.

The Congress of Vienna, having thus created an assembly, did not proceed to define its powers. The jurisdiction of the Diet was left to be decided by the Diet itself. It was decided that the first business of the Diet should be the framing of the fundamental laws of the confederation and the establishment of the organic institutions. This might seem to be unduly elastic and to be giving to the assembly an opportunity to claim the largest powers for itself. But this was not to be feared, as in the adoption and in the change of any fundamental law, a unanimous vote was required, and all the delegates were dependent upon home governments which were averse to a strong union and which had now the absolute power to prevent the rise of one.

This Federal Act did not create a fatherland. There

AD THIERS, FIRST PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC.

NORTH SEA
KGD. of DENMARK
Schleswig
Duchy Holstein
Helgoland
Brit. since 1808
1814
HAMBURG
GRD. DUC. OLDENBURG
KGD. of HANOVER
Bremen
Hanover
Brunswick
Magdeburg
Prov. Saxony
Westphalia
Rhine Province
Cologne
Aachen
Liege
Limburg
Brussels
Antwerp
Ghent
Bruges
KGD. of BELGIUM
1834
KGD. of the NETHERLANDS
Amsterdam
The Hague
Rotterdam
Utrecht
Zuider Sea
Groningen
Arnhem
Nassau
Frankfurt
Wiesbaden
Mainz
Lower Rhine
GRD. DY LUXEMBURG
1834
Luxemburg
Metz
Nancy
Strassburg
KGD. OF FRANCE
Empire since 1852
REPUBLIC 1848-1852
Paris
Reims
Troyes
Dijon
Besancon
Belfort
Lyon
Savoy
France
1860
Geneva
Lausanne
SWITZERLAND
Neufchatel
1857
Basel
Zurich
Constance
Lake Constance
Bavaria
Munich
Augsburg
Ratisbon
Regensburg
Nuremberg
Bamberg
Wurzburg
Bayreuth
Erlangen
KINGD. of WURTTEMBERG
Stuttgart
Ulm
Hohenzollern
Heilbronn
GRD. DY BADEN
Carlsruhe
Freiburg
Hesse Darmstadt
Hesse Cassel
ELECTORATE of HESSE
Marburg
Giessen
Frankfurt
Coburg
Gotha
Weimar
Eisenach
Erfurt
Saxe Meiningen
Saxe Altenburg
Saxe Coburg
Saxe Weimar
Saxe Gotha
Saxe Royal
Dresden
Leipzig
Halle
Merseburg
Brunswick
Hanover
Osnabruck
Minden
Celle
Luneburg
Lauenburg
Lubeck
Rostock
Schwerin
Mecklenburg
Strelitz
Oldenburg
Eutin
Kiel
Flensburg
Apenrade
Sylt
Tondern
Husum
Tonning
Eckernforde
Fehmarn
Schleswig
Aarhus
Aalborg
Fyen
Laaland
Falster
Copenhagen
Helsingor
Elsinore
Kronborg
Roskilde
Frederikshavn
Skagen
Hjorring
Aalborg
Viborg
Aarhus
Randers
Horsens
Vejle
Kolding
Esbjerg
Ribe
Haderslev
Sonderborg
Aabenraa
Flensburg
Schleswig
Eckernforde
Kiel
Neumunster
Itzehoe
Glueckstadt
Altona
Pinneberg
Wedel
Harburg
Stade
Cuxhaven
Bremerhaven
Emden
Aurich
Leer
Papenburg
Meppen
Lingen
Nordhorn
Bentheim
Rheine
Steinfurt
Munster
Coesfeld
Recklinghausen
Dortmund
Hamm
Soest
Paderborn
Detmold
Lippe
Bielefeld
Minden
Osnabruck
Gottingen
Kassel
Fulda
Hanau
Aschaffenburg
Darmstadt
Mannheim
Heidelberg
Karlsruhe
Rastatt
Offenburg
Freiburg
Basel
Schaffhausen
Constance
Lindau
Kempten
Memmingen
Ulm
Augsburg
Ingolstadt
Donauworth
Ansbach
Nuremberg
Bayreuth
Coburg
Meiningen
Fulda
Hersfeld
Eisenach
Gotha
Erfurt
Weimar
Jena
Saalfeld
Kulmbach
Hof
Plauen
Zwickau
Chemnitz
Freiberg
Dresden
Meissen
Leipzig
Halle
Merseburg
Wittenberg
Dessau
Magdeburg
Zerbst
Blankenburg
Quedlinburg
Aschersleben
Stolberg
Nordhausen
Mulhausen
Eisenach
Wartburg
Rudolstadt
Sondershausen
Arnstadt
Ilmenau
Suhl
Meiningen
Coburg
Kissingen
Schweinfurt
Wurzburg
Bamberg
Forchheim
Erlangen
Nuremberg
Ansbach
Heilbronn
Hall
Crailsheim
Aalen
Ellwangen
Gmund
Rottweil
Tubingen
Reutlingen
Stuttgart
Ludwigsburg
Heilbronn
Mergentheim
Tauberbischofsheim
Wertheim
Aschaffenburg
Hanau
Frankfurt
Wiesbaden
Mainz
Worms
Speyer
Landau
Zweibrucken
Kaiserslautern
Neustadt
Bad Durkheim
Frankenthal
Mannheim
Heidelberg
Karlsruhe
Rastatt
Baden
Offenburg
Freiburg
Lorrach
Waldshut
Schaffhausen
Constance
Lindau
Bregenz
Feldkirch
Vorarlberg
Liechtenstein
Chur
Coire
Innsbruck
Tyrol
Bozen
Trent
Brixen
Meran
Sterzing
Lienz
Villach
Klagenfurt
Salzburg
Linz
Passau
Ingolstadt
Kempten
Memmingen
Ulm
Augsburg
Munich
Landshut
Straubing
Regensburg
Ratisbon
Amberg
Weiden
Bayreuth

THE GERMAN CONFEDERATION 1815-1866.

0 50 100

English Miles.

Empire of Austria

Kingdom of Prussia

The States belonging to the German Confederation are colored all over

ABBREVIATIONS:

Gust. - *Gustozza*	Old. - *Oldenburg*
Brns. - *Brunswick*	Sch. - *Schwartzburden*
HH - *Hessen Homburg*	S.L. *Schaumburg-Lippe*
E.H *Elect Hessia*	Sp - *Speyer*

PRINCE LEOPOLD, AFTERWARD KING OF BELGIUM.

was no king or emperor of Germany. There was no German flag. No one was, properly speaking, a German citizen. He was a Prussian, or Austrian, or Bavarian citizen, as the case might be. The federal government had no diplomatic representatives in the other countries of Europe, but each state had, or could have, its own diplomatic corps. The German as German had no legal standing abroad,—only as a citizen of a separate state that might, but generally did not, command respect. Each state had the right to make alliances of every kind with the others or with non-German states. The only serious obligation they assumed toward each other was that they should enter into no engagement that should be directed against the safety of the Confederation or that of any individual state within the union; that they should not make war upon each other upon any pretext, but should submit their contentions to the Diet; that if the Confederation should declare war, all the states should support it, and that none should negotiate separately with the enemy or alone make peace.

Germany not a nation.

Such was the constitution given to Germany by the Congress of Vienna. It created a government in which obstruction was easy, positive action very difficult. Each state possessed powers of delaying decisions of the Diet interminably, even, in many cases, of rendering them impossible. Moreover this government, weak as it was, was not even purely German. Three rulers of foreign states were members of it and could influence its deliberations, particularly in those cases where an individual veto would prove decisive, that is, in all the most fundamental and organic matters. The king of England was represented for Hanover, a possession of the English royal family, the king of Denmark for Holstein, the king of the Netherlands for Luxemburg. Prussia and Austria too might be influenced to look upon the Confederation in the light of their international position and interests, Austria particularly, as only one-third of the Austrian Empire was within the bounds of the Confederation.

The international character of the Confederation.

The other two-thirds, mainly non-German, were not included, yet their interests might dictate the policy of the Austrian delegates. Thus Hungarians, Poles, and Italians might indirectly influence the determination of purely German questions in the German Diet. The international rather than national character of this Confederation was further manifested in the fact that the chief articles of the Federal Act establishing it were inserted in the Final Act of the Congress of Vienna, and as such were under the collective guaranty of the powers and therefore presumably not to be altered without their consent.

It is clear that a Germany so organized was not a nation but only a loose confederation of states expressly declared to be independent and sovereign, a confederation designed simply for mutual protection, and poorly adapted even for that. "Judged by the requirements of a practical political organization," says von Sybel, "this German Act of Confederation, produced with so much effort, possessed about all the faults that can render a constitution utterly useless." He adds that it "was received by the German nation at large, partly with cold indifference, and partly with patriotic indignation."

Dissatisfaction of the Germans with this system.

This indignation was vehemently felt by the Liberals, who, under the influence of the tremendous struggles with Napoleon, had come passionately to demand a close and firm union of all Germans that thus they might realize in their institutions and in the face of all the world the greatness which they felt was in them. The exaltation of the final struggle with Napoleon had only heightened the demand of the more progressive spirits for national unity, that thus Germany might never henceforth be subjected to the humiliations of the past at the hands of foreigners. This longing for unity and strength, which in the patriotic atmosphere of the late wars had seemed so near realization, was now seen to be a hope deferred. German unity was, according to Metternich, an "infamous object," and the views of the diplomats at Vienna

were more those of Metternich than of the Liberals. The latter were indignant at what they called the great deception of Vienna, and their bitterness was to be a factor in the later development of Germany.

Why the problem of German unity was so difficult.

That they were from the very force of circumstances, the very nature of existing conditions, inevitably destined to disappointment we can see more clearly than did they, swept along as they were by the strong patriotic current of the hour, little appreciating the bewildering, baffling complexity of their problem. The object they aimed at was one of supreme difficulty. German unity was not simply a matter of sentiment, however fine and just, but was a hard, practical question only to be answered, if at all, by ripe political sense and wisdom. It involved the adjustment of many conflicting and perhaps irreconcilable interests. Traditions, centuries old, must be overcome. Mere inertia was a powerful obstacle. And another was the fact that the future of Germany was not left for the Germans to work out alone. It was a part of the work of the Congress of Vienna, of the general settlement of Europe. This brought it about that the Act of Federation was hastily framed and that, too, partially by powers careless of German interests or hostile to them. It was no desire of neighboring states to have a strong and united Germany. But the main obstacle lay in one of the oldest, most persistent facts of German political life and history, the strong states-rights or particularist feeling. No effective union could be established unless the various members would surrender some of their authority. Not one of the German princes was willing to pay the price. Austria, more non-German than German, could not for that very reason hope to be the supreme power in a really united Germany, therefore she favored a loose union wherein she might, by playing upon rival passions, enjoy a lesser leadership. Prussia could not be given the leadership in a new empire, as Austria would not consent and the lesser states would be alarmed. Obviously, none of the smaller states

could hope to exercise a power they would not grant to either of the greater. Moreover, they believed that any sacrifice of sovereignty would only leave them exposed to the aggrandizing passions of the great. At first these lesser states, indeed, wished to be entirely independent, to have no union at all, even that of a loose confederation. The conclusive argument against this was that Germany must at least be strong enough so that no second series of events like that of the Napoleonic invasions and conquests should again occur.

The states-right feeling.

Thus it is seen that the radical evil of the German situation was the particularism or excessive individualism of the states. This was nothing new, but had been for centuries the most powerful fact. This feeling was now even more pronounced than ever, for the reason that the lesser states had latterly grown stronger by their absorption of their neighbors in the period just elapsed. National unity had been wrecked by it. It could only be restored, says Sybel, by the further extreme development of this spirit—till one state should become so large that it would overshadow all the rest and force them to recognize its ascendency—then the selfishness of one would end in the unity of all. Now the unity of England and France had been brought about in precisely this way, by the absorption by one state of all its rivals, but the outcome of German evolution had been peculiar, in that it had seen the rise of two great powers, not one, Prussia and Austria, neither able to conquer or push the other aside, and each most jealous of any increase of the other's power. Such was the play of ambition and interest, baffling the ingenuity and ability of those who desired a real and fruitful union of all Germans. A Prussian field marshal, Clausewitz, wrote at about this time: "Germany can achieve political unity only in one way, by the sword; by one of its states subjugating all the others," a thought put later into a more resounding phrase by Bismarck, and expressing approximately the method by which unity was finally achieved. But so hard a doctrine lay be-

Dualism the outcome of German evolution.

yond the range of understanding of the early nineteenth century.

The demand for constitutional government.

The Liberals of Germany, eager for national unity, thus suffered a severe defeat at Vienna. They were given a confederation, looser than that of the Holy Roman Empire, and with none of the glory and luster of the latter, a union only nominal, inefficient, and prosaic, containing no vital force. The Liberals were also eager for reforms within the states, for constitutional government, for parliaments with real powers, for the end of absolutism. Here again they were disappointed. They had hoped to get a mandatory provision in the Federal Act establishing representative legislatures in each one of the states of Germany. In appealing to his people to rally around him in the war against Napoleon, the King of Prussia had very recently promised his people a constitution and had urged at the Congress of Vienna that the Federal Act should require every member of the Confederation to grant a representative constitution to his subjects within a year. Metternich, even more opposed to free political institutions than to a strong central government, succeeded in thwarting the reformers at this point also, by having this explicit and mandatory declaration made vague and lifeless. Thus the famous Article XIII of the Federal Act was made to read: "A constitution based upon the system of estates will be estabished in all the states of the union." The character of the new constitutions was not sketched; and the time limit was omitted. A journalist was justified in saying that all that was guaranteed to the German people was an "unlimited right of expectation." The future was to show the vanity even of expectation, the hollowness of even so mild a promise. The Liberals had desired something more substantial than hope. Austria and Prussia, the two leading states, governing the great mass of the German people, never executed this provision. Nor did many of the smaller states.

Metternich's successful opposition.

Germany, then, in 1815, consisted of thirty-eight loosely

connected states. Some of these were very large, some exceedingly small. Prussia and Austria ranked with the greatest powers of Europe. Some of them were old, had their individual history, traditions, and prestige. Others were new, or had recently undergone such sweeping changes as to be practically new. Their future was highly problematical. Their boundaries were intertwined and complicated. Some were what are called enclaves, that is, were entirely surrounded by another state, having no egress to the outside world save through the neighbor's territory. Economic life could not flourish owing to the tariffs and change of coinage that met merchant and trader at every border, and owing also to the wretched means of communication and transportation. These states presented many varieties of governments. There were some where absolutism prevailed, where the prince was the law-giver, the executor, and the judge, ruling without the aid of any assembly, without outside restraints. Such were the two greatest, Austria and Prussia, and such were several of the smaller. There were others where the prince was assisted in his work by assemblies, bodies which the people had no right to claim, but which the ruler in his condescension saw fit to call about him, in no sense popular bodies, chosen by the people, but composed mainly of nobles. These exercised little control over the acts of the prince, but were at least in a position to present grievances. Most of the states of Germany, as Hanover, Mecklenburg, and Saxony, were of this kind. There were other states where the prince granted a written constitution, somewhat after the French model, providing for an elective assembly to which was given some power over the government's proposals for taxes and laws. Such an assembly was not to control the Government, as did the English Parliament, by forcing the ruler to choose his ministers from persons satisfactory to it. The prince was the government in every instance but he preferred to ask the co-operation of his people up to a certain point, and he granted them rights, such as free-

Various forms of government in the different German states.

dom of the press and of speech, which were coming to be more and more demanded by Europeans generally. Saxe-Weimar was the most prominent state of this class. Its prince received the sincere laudation of the Liberals and the sincere aversion of Metternich.

Popular sovereignty nowhere recognized.

In none of these systems was the principle of popular sovereignty recognized. Germany was thoroughly monarchical. The only question was whether monarchy should undergo a change of nature more or less extensive, or should assert its old prerogatives in all their fulness. After the disappointments of the Vienna Congress the Liberals of Germany pinned their hope to the increase of states of the Saxe-Weimar class. It was clear that Germans were not to have unity. Might they not have political and civil liberty? There seemed some ground for optimism. Constitutions were granted in the states of southern Germany in the next few years, in Bavaria and Baden in 1818, in Würtemberg in 1819, and in Hesse-Darmstadt in 1820. It matters not whether the princes granted these for selfish reasons in order to gain popular support for a struggle which they felt was imminent with their more powerful colleagues, Prussia and Austria, for the advantage to their peoples remained the same.

Constitutions granted in certain states.

But it soon became evident after 1815 that while there were signs of progress there were more signs of a menacing reaction. Austria having set her house in order, having put a Chinese wall about her empire, marked innovation in the neighboring lands for special hostility when the favorable moment should arrive. Metternich's programme was stated in one of his confidential reports to his Emperor: "We must lead Germany to adopt our principles without our appearing to impose those principles upon her." This could not be done abruptly and harshly. Two personages were too powerful to be treated summarily, Alexander I of Russia and Frederick William III of Prussia. The former was in 1815 nothing less than a "Jacobin" in Metternich's opinion, as

he was himself granting a constitution to Poland and favoring constitutionalism in Germany and Italy and elsewhere. Reaction could not be successful unless he should come to see the error of his ways. The King of Prussia had promised a constitution to his country as explicitly as a man could. Metternich was pre-eminently a man who knew how to bide his time, and who knew how, when the proper moment arrived, to strike hard. His time was not long in coming. Frederick William III was both procrastinating and timid. Moreover, the reactionary party shortly after 1815 won ascendency at his court. Two years went by before he appointed the special committee to undertake the preparation of the promised constitution. Its report after a long and slow investigation was unfavorable to the project, which was finally allowed to drop. The Prussian Government slipped back easily into the old familiar autocratic grooves. According to Metternich the king's chief mental trait was "the repressive," and this gradually reasserted itself. More important was the change in Alexander I, who by 1818, for reasons that are somewhat obscure, had gone over to conservatism. With the rulers of Russia and Prussia in this state of mind Metternich's course was made easy. He was able to use certain current events to render himself incontestably the dominant personality in Europe, and to secure the prevalence of the Austrian principles of government far beyond the confines of Austria itself.

The King of Prussia becomes reactionary.

Indignation of the Liberals.

The years immediately succeeding 1815 were years of restlessness and uncertainty. The German Liberals were, as we have seen, indignant at the "great deception" of Vienna. But they hoped that at least the various states of Germany might be reformed along constitutional lines. Article XIII of the Federal Act rendered this possible, though it did not, to their great regret, ensure it. Here again was hope deferred, for as the years went by the signs that little had been gained in the direction of larger liberty multiplied. Only a few states entered the new path. The large ones stood aloof,

and in many of the small ones the old régime was restored in its entirety by the returning princes and with a lamentable lack of humor. The disappointment of Liberals was intense, their criticism trenchant. The chief seat of disaffection was found in the universities and in newspapers edited by university men. As the subjection of these centers of agitation was to be the main object of Metternich's German policy, it is well to describe their activity.

Ferment in the universities.

The students of Jena had during the Napoleonic wars founded a society called the Burschenschaft, whose purpose was the inculcation of an intense national patriotism, the constant exaltation of the ideal of a common fatherland. Societies were nothing new in German universities, but the previous ones, the Corps, had included in their membership only those coming from the same state or province. They thus preserved that sense of localism which was the bane of German life. The Burschenschaft was based on the opposite principle of membership derived from all the different states, thus ignoring local lines, and teaching a larger duty, a larger devotion, a larger idea of association. Glowing patriotism was the characteristic of the new organization. It soon succeeded in establishing chapters in sixteen universities. It was decided to hold a meeting of representatives of all the chapters and to give it the character of a patriotic celebration. The place chosen was the Wartburg, a castle famous as the shelter of Luther after his outlawry at the Diet of Worms, and the date chosen was October 18, 1817, famous as being the fourth anniversary of the battle of Leipsic, and approximately the three hundredth of the posting of Luther's Theses. Several hundred students met. Their festival was religious as well as patriotic. They partook of the Lord's Supper together and listened to impassioned speeches commemorating the great moments in German history, the liberation from Rome and the liberation from Napoleon. In the evening they built a bonfire and threw into it various symbols of the hated reaction, notably an illiberal pamphlet of which

The Wartburg Festival.

the King of Prussia had expressed his approval. They then dispersed, but their deed lived after them. This student performance had unexpected consequences. What was apparently a harmless and exuberant jollification seemed to conservative rulers and statesmen evidence of an unhealthy and dangerous ferment of opinion, and the rumors that gained currency about this celebration made it famous. It enjoyed a reputation altogether out of proportion to its real importance, which was slight. Metternich described it to the German rulers as a portent of far greater dangers sure to come. Shortly an event much more alarming occurred which seemed to justify this prognostication, the murder of Kotzebue, a journalist and playwright, who was hated by the students as a spy of Russia in Germany. A divinity student, Karl Sand, went to his house in Mannheim and stabbed him in the heart, March 23, 1819. Later an attempt was made to assassinate an important official of the Government of Nassau. These and other occurrences played perfectly into the hands of Metternich, who was seeking the means of establishing reaction in Germany as it had been established in Austria. They gave him what he most needed, a weapon whereby to dissuade Alexander I and Frederick William III from all further toying with liberalism and to convert the Holy Alliance, hitherto a mere trumpet for biblical phrases, into an engine of oppression. Were not all of these occurrences manifestations of the same anarchical spirit, the desire to overthrow monarchical institutions? All were indiscriminately ascribed to the Burschenschaft, whereas it had only been responsible for the Wartburg festival. The steps now taken to combat liberalism, which was charged with such unequal misdeeds, form a landmark in German history.

The murder of Kotzebue.

The Holy Alliance converted into an engine of oppression.

Metternich, having previously had an interview with Frederick William III, in which he was assured of the latter's support in the policy to be outlined to silence the opposition, called the ministers of those German governments of which he felt sure to a series of conferences at Carlsbad. In these

conferences was fashioned the triumph of reaction in Germany. By the decrees which were adopted Metternich became the conqueror of the Confederation. Only eight states were represented, those upon which Metternich could count. The decrees there drawn up were then submitted to the Diet at Frankfort, all the customary modes of procedure of that body were cast aside, and a vote with no preceding debate was forced, so that the representatives of the states who had not been at Carlsbad did not have time to ask instructions of their Governments. Thus the decrees, rushed by illegal and violent methods through the Diet, became the law of Germany, binding upon every state. They were the work of Austria, seconded by Prussia. The small states resented the indignity to which they had been subjected but could do nothing. Carlsbad signifies in German history the suppression of liberty for a generation. As these decrees really determined the political system of Germany until 1848, they merit a full description.

The Carlsbad Decrees.

It was stated once for all that the famous Article XIII of the act establishing the German Confederation, namely, that "a constitution based upon the system of estates will be established in all the states of the union" should not be interpreted as meaning constitutions of a foreign pattern, but representation of estates such as had been customary in German states even earlier. It was the earnest desire of the Liberals to get away from such old and useless assemblies. The great forces active against the prevalence of Metternich's system were free parliaments, free speech, and a free press. It was hoped that the first of these was thus prevented.

Provision concerning constitutional government.

It was next provided that there should be at every university in the land a special representative to watch both professors and students. The function of these agents should be "to see to the strictest enforcement of existing laws and disciplinary regulations; to observe carefully the spirit which is shown by the instructors in the university in

Control of the universities.

their public lectures and regular courses, and, without directly interfering in scientific matters, or in the methods of teaching, to give a salutary direction to the instruction, having in view the future attitude of the students." It was provided that all teachers who should "propagate harmful doctrines hostile to public order or subversive of existing governmental institutions," that is, all who should not hold absolutism, as Metternich understood it, to be the only legitimate form of government, should be removed from their positions and that once so removed they should not be appointed to positions in any other educational institution in any state. Other provisions were directed against secret or unauthorized societies in the universities, particularly that "association established some years since under the name" of the Burschenschaft, "since the very conception of the society implies the utterly unallowable plan of permanent fellowship and constant communication between the various universities." Furthermore "no student, who shall be expelled from a university by a decision of the University Senate which was ratified or prompted by the agent of the government, or who shall have left the institution in order to escape such a decision, shall be received in any other university." [1]

Prohibition of student societies.

By these provisions it was expected that the entire academic community, professors and students, would be reduced to silence. The universities had become the centers of political agitation. That agitation would now cease under compulsion. There was one other enemy, the press, and drastic provisions were adopted to smother its independence beneath a comprehensive censorship. Finally, a special commission was created to ferret out all secret revolutionary societies and conspiracies that might threaten the nation, and this commission was to have full powers to examine and arrest any German, no matter of what state he might

The censorship of the press.

[1] Quotations are from University of Pennsylvania Translations and Reprints, Vol. I, No. 3. Edited by J. H. Robinson.

be a citizen. It discovered very little, but it pursued for years a policy as vexatious as it was petty.

Reaction the order of the day in Germany.

The Carlsbad Conference is an important turning point in the history of central Europe. It signalized the dominance of Metternich in Germany as well as in Austria. Its most important feature is the surrender of Prussia to Austrian leadership. Down to 1819 there was ground for hope that Prussia might be a leader, though a cautious one, in the liberalization of Germany. That hope now vanished. Reaction was henceforth the order of the day in this great state. Frederick William III. shortly abandoned definitely all idea of granting the constitution which he had promised in 1815. In the period of national humiliation from 1807 to 1813 a notably liberal spirit had characterized the actions of the Prussian Government. Many reforms had been effected at the instigation of such men as Stein. But the period was too brief and the reforms remained incomplete. It was expected that they would be perfected after 1815, but now it was clear that they would not. Indeed, in some respects, though fortunately not in all, the liberal achievements of those years were curtailed. But after 1819 the period of full reaction came in. In many respects this period was more odious in Prussia than in any other state. The persecution of "demagogues" was a sorry spectacle, as it was in reality largely a persecution of men who should have had all honor shown them as national heroes. Jahn, the founder of gymnastic societies, whch had been most effective in nerving the young men of Prussia to heroic action, was for five years subjected to the inquisition of the police and to severe imprisonment, only to be discharged because nothing could be found against him meriting punishment. Arndt, whose impassioned poems had intensified the national patriotism in the wars against Napoleon, was shamefully treated. His house was searched, his papers were ransacked. The charges against him show the triviality of this petty police inquisition. One official discovered revolution in the expres-

The persecution of Liberals.

sion "that lies beyond my sphere." Sphere meant a ball, a ball a bullet. Was not that a summons to insurrection and murder? Arndt indignantly protested that he hated "all secret intrigues like snakes of hell." Nevertheless he was removed from his professorship and for twenty years was prevented from pursuing his vocation. Private letters were systematically opened by the police in the search for some trace of revolution. Even Gneisenau, despite his brilliant record as a soldier, had for years to experience this invasion of his private rights. Spies went to hear the sermons of the most popular preacher in Berlin, Schleiermacher, and reported it as a highly suspicious circumstance that he had said that we owe to Christ the liberation of all spiritual forces and that every true Christian must believe that the kingdom of truth will conquer the kingdom of darkness. A publisher was forbidden to bring out a new edition of Fichte's Address to the German Nation, which had so splendidly stirred the youth of Prussia in the years of Napoleon's supremacy.

Prussia a docile follower of Austria.

This was, in the opinion of all Liberals, the great treason of Prussia, this abdication of independent judgment, this docile surrender to the leadership of Austria. "Prussia," said Metternich to the Russian ambassador, "has left us the place which many Germans wished to give to her."

The situation was much the same in the other German states. With Austria and Prussia hand in glove, there was little opportunity for the lesser states. The spirit of the Carlsbad Decrees hung heavily over all Germany. Made even stronger the following year by the Vienna Conference of 1820, this system remained in force until the decade beginning with 1840. The revolutions of 1830 brought forth additional decrees in 1832 and 1834 intensifying the persecution of the academic world and of politicians suspected of liberalism. Metternich had succeeded in extending his system over the German Confederation. We shall now see how other countries were affected by the same system, how its influence expanded still further.

CHAPTER III

REACTION AND REVOLUTION IN SPAIN AND ITALY

SPAIN

The fundamental purpose of the rulers of Europe after 1815, as we have seen, was to prevent the "revolution," as they called it, from again breaking out; in other words, to prevent democratic and constitutional ideas from once more becoming dominant. The precautions taken by these conservatives passed in the political language of the time as the Metternich system. Sufficient precautions had been taken, as we have seen, in central Europe. France was powerless to disturb for a long while to come. England was stiffly loyal to her old régime. But just as order seemed solidly re-established events occurred in the two southern peninsulas of Europe, Spain and Italy, which showed that a system of repression to be successful must be Argus-eyed and omnipresent. It is necessary, therefore, at this point to trace briefly the history of southern Europe that we may understand the events of 1820, the first real challenge of the Metternich system.

Spanish Constitution of 1812.

In 1808 Napoleon had by an act of violence seized the crown of Spain, and until 1814 had kept the Spanish king, Ferdinand VII, virtually a prisoner in France, placing his own brother Joseph on the vacant throne. The Spaniards rose against the usurper and for years carried on a vigorous guerilla warfare, aided by the English, and ending finally in success. As their king was in the hands of the enemy they proceeded in his name to frame a government. Being liberally minded they drew up a constitution, the famous

Constitution of 1812, a document thoroughly saturated with the principles of the French Constitution of 1791. It asserted the sovereignty of the people, vesting the executive power in the king, the legislative in the Cortes or Assembly, a body consisting of a single chamber and elected by indirect universal suffrage, the citizens of the colonies having the same right to vote as did those of the mother country. Some of the features of the French Constitution which had worked badly were nevertheless adopted. Deputies were to be chosen for two years and to be ineligible for re-election. Ministers might not be members of the chamber. Henceforth the Cortes were to be the central organ of government, the king being very subordinate. He might not leave the country without their consent, nor marry, nor might he dissolve or prorogue the Assembly, and in the intervals between sessions a committee of the Cortes was to watch over the execution of the Constitution and the laws. The Constitution proclaimed the principles of liberty and equality before the law, thus abolishing the old régime. The extreme liberality of this Constitution is explained by the fact that it was the work of deputies coming in the main from the coast provinces, which were more democratic than the others. The classes hitherto dominant in Spain, the nobility and the clergy, for the time being lost their supremacy. The Constitution was the work of a small minority, was never submitted to the people for ratification, and its durability was therefore problematical. Indeed, its doom was sealed by the reappearance in Spain, on the downfall of Napoleon, of the legitimate king, Ferdinand VII.

Ferdinand VII, 1784-1833.

This prince, now restored to his throne, was ill-fitted for rule, both by temperament and training. Cruel, suspicious, deceitful, unscrupulous, his character was odious, his intellect lacked all distinction. His education had been woefully neglected, nor had experience taught him anything of statesmanship. He had not used his leisure as Napoleon's prisoner for reading or the study of political questions.

But, instead, he had embroidered with his own hands a robe of white silk with ornaments of gold for the Madonna of the altar in the church at Valençay, a fact which was made known to the Spanish people by his confessor. Indeed, the pamphlet which contained this edifying announcement went through seven editions in a short time,—a fact that not only paints the King but his people as well.

Abolition of the Constitution.

There was every reason to expect that such a man would thrust aside the paper constitution that so greatly limited his power, if he felt able to do so. The boundlessly enthusiastic, even hysterical manner in which the Spaniards received him convinced him that he could go to any length. The Constitution of 1812 had the support of only a very small minority of the educated people. The nobility, the clergy, many of the leaders of the army, and the ignorant and fanatical populace wanted a king of the old type. The King, seeing the way made plain, promptly took action. Before he reached his capital he declared the Constitution and the decrees of the Cortes null and void, "as if these things had never been done." By this stroke and the rapturous acquiescence of the people absolutism was restored. A furious reaction began, a wild hunt for everyone in any way connected with the recent history of Spain. Liberals and those who had adhered to Joseph, Napoleon's brother, were persecuted. The Inquisition was re-established; the Jesuits returned in triumph. The press was gagged once more. Liberal books were destroyed wherever found, and particularly all copies of the Constitution. Thousands of political prisoners were punished with varying severity. Ferdinand would probably have been forced into a reactionary policy by his own people and by the other powers of Europe, even had his personal inclinations not prompted him to it. But this reaction was much too furious, lasted too long, and in the end weakened the King's position.

Persecution of Liberals.

Inefficiency of the Government.

The Government of Ferdinand, vigorous in punishing Liberals, was utterly incompetent and indolent in other matters.

Spain, a country of about eleven million people, was wretchedly poor and ignorant. Agriculture was primitive. Commerce and industry were shackled by monopolies and unreasonable prohibitions upon exportation and importation. Industrial activity was further lesssened by the large number of saints' days, which were carefully observed. What education there was was in the hands of ecclesiastics. The Government of Ferdinand made no attempt to improve these deplorable conditions. But in addition to all this it failed to discharge the most fundamental duty of any government, that is, to preserve the integrity of the empire. The vast transatlantic possessions of Spain had risen in revolt. The reasons for this revolt, which presaged the downfall of the proud Spanish Empire, were: the continued and varied misgovernment of the home country which regarded the colonies as simply sources of wealth to be ingeniously exploited for the benefit of the home government, the taste of relative freedom they had enjoyed between 1810 and 1815 when the home government was otherwise occupied, the example of the United States and its successful war of independence, and the encouragement of England, seeking wider markets. Ferdinand could probably have kept his empire intact had he been willing to make the concessions demanded by the Americans, larger commercial liberty and considerable political autonomy. This he would not do. He would rule his empire as it had always been ruled, his colonies as he ruled the mother country. The result was revolution from Mexico to the southern tip of South America. Ferdinand's task was to reconquer this vast region by force. This force he did not have. He hoped for the support of the Holy Alliance, which, however, was not forthcoming. He, therefore, was thrown upon his own resources. By 1819 he had collected an army of over twenty thousand men at Cadiz. Suddenly the army rose in revolt against the Government, and the first of those revolutions of southern Europe against the restored monarchs occurred.

Disintegration of the Spanish Empire.

Neglect of the army and the navy.

With singular lack of perspicacity, the restored Bourbons of Spain had neglected or insulted the army, the very weapon which reaction in the other countries of Europe had taken every means to conciliate and win. Many of the ablest officers had been degraded; poor rations, poor barracks, insufficient pay, in arrears at that, had created a feeling of deep irritation in the army, which became the breeding place of conspiracies, the real revolutionary element in the state. The navy, too, so essential for the preservation of a transoceanic colonial empire, had been allowed to fall into the most shameful decay until it consisted of but little else than the king's own pleasure yachts. The officers were utterly poor. The only relief the Government granted them was permission to support themselves by fishing.

Under such conditions military outbreaks were natural. Insurrections occurred repeatedly, in 1814, 1815, 1816, 1817, 1818 and 1819. The failure in each case only increased the severity with which the Government pursued all those suspected of liberalism. In 1820 the army rose again, driven to desperation by the stories of horror told by soldiers returning from America, and believing that they were about to be sent to certain death.

Revolution of 1820.

On January 1, 1820, Riego, a colonel in the army, proclaimed the Constitution of 1812 and led a few troops through the province of Andalusia, endeavoring to arouse the south of Spain. He was unsuccessful. His force gradually dwindled away, attracting no popular support. But it had served its purpose. As the revolution was dying out in the south it kindled in the opposite end of the peninsula, under the Pyrenees and along the Ebro. The Constitution of 1812 was proclaimed there and the flames spread eastward to the great cities of Saragossa and Barcelona. Shortly riots broke out in Madrid itself. The King, learning that he could not rely upon his soldiers even in his capital, and thoroughly frightened, yielded to the demands of the scattered and incoherent revolution, and on the evening of

March 7, 1820, proclaimed the Constitution of 1812, promised to maintain it, and declared that he would harry out of the country those who would not support it. "Let us advance frankly," he said, "myself leading the way, along the constitutional path." The text of the Constitution was posted in every city, and parish priests were ordered to expound it to their congregations.

Thus revolution had triumphed again, and only five years after Waterloo. An absolute monarchy, based on divine right, had been changed into a constitutional monarchy based on the sovereignty of the people. Would the example be followed elsewhere? Would the Holy Alliance look on in silence? Had the revolutionary spirit been so carefully smothered in Austria, Germany, and France, only to blaze forth in outlying sections of Europe? Answers to these questions were quickly forthcoming.

ITALY

Napoleon on Italian unity.

In the leisure of St. Helena, Napoleon I wrote, concerning Italy: "Italy is surrounded by the Alps and the sea. Her natural limits are defined with as much exactitude as if she were an island. Italy is only united to the continent by one hundred and fifty leagues of frontier and these one hundred and fifty leagues are fortified by the highest barrier that can be opposed to man. Italy, isolated between her natural limits, is destined to form a great and powerful nation. Italy is one nation; unity of language, customs and literature, must, within a period more or less distant, unite her inhabitants under one sole government. And Rome will, without the slightest doubt, be chosen by the Italians as their capital." [1]

Napoleon was now in a position where he was powerless to aid in this achievement, even had he been so disposed. But the time was very fresh in men's minds when they believed that the great commander was to use his talent and oppor-

[1] Cesaresco, The Liberation of Italy, 3.

tunity to give them unity and freedom. He had not done so. Yet in a very real sense modern Italy began under his empire. He took the country a long step forward toward its ideal.

Napoleon's activity in Italy had been most revolutionary. He had driven all the native princes from the peninsula. Only the kings of Naples and Piedmont still retained some semblance of authority, for each fortunately had an island to which he could flee, whence the French could not drive him, as the British controlled the sea. The former spent several years in Sicily, the latter in the island of Sardinia. Napoleon did not formally unite all Italy, but he annexed a part directly to the French Empire, a part he made into the Kingdom of Italy, with himself as King and his step-son, Eugène Beauharnais, as Viceroy, and the remainder constituted the Kingdom of Naples, over which Murat, brother-in-law of Napoleon, ruled. Thus, though there was not unity, there were only three states where formerly there had been a dozen. Yet, in an important sense, there was unity, for it was the directing mind of the French Emperor that permeated and largely controlled the policy of all three. The French did much for the regeneration of Italy. They abolished feudalism, they gave uniform and enlightened laws, they opened careers to talent, they stimulated industry. New ideas, political and social, penetrated the peninsula with them. Italians henceforth would never be the same as they had been. Barriers, physical, material, intellectual, had been thrown down, and could never be permanently set up again. Of course there was the reverse. The burdens imposed in the place of those removed were heavy. Napoleon made the Italians a part of his general European system and forced them to give freely of their money and their men for purposes that concerned them only slightly, if at all. Sixty thousand Italians perished in his wars in Spain and Russia. His shameless robbery of their works of art gave deep offense. His treatment of the Pope wounded many in their religious sensibilities, and he ignored the national sentiment whenever he chose.

Significance of Napoleon's activity in Italy.

The awakening of Italy.

Yet the later achievement of unity and liberty was made much easier because Napoleon had passed that way. He shook the country out of its century-old somnolence. Service in his armies increased the strenuousness of the Italians and taught them the art of war. The very fact that they had witnessed and participated in great events imparted an unknown energy to these easy-going sons of the south. Napoleon had exiled every one of the Italian princes. They might be restored, but their prestige was irrevocably gone. He had even driven the Pope from his states, and had abolished the temporal power. What had been done once might perhaps be done again. There had been for a few years a state bearing the name Kingdom of Italy. The memory of that fact could not be uprooted by all the monarchs of Christendom. It was an augury full of hope, a beacon pointing the sure and steadfast way.

The decision of the Congress of Vienna.

Of all this the Allies, at their famous Congress of Vienna, took no note. They were playing the short politics of the hour. They paid no attention to the impalpable forces of the human spirit. They looked upon the future of Italy as a matter quite at their disposal and they reconstructed the peninsula without asking its opinion or consent. A people numbering more than seventeen million had nothing to say about its own fate. The mighty men of Europe sitting in Vienna considered that their affair. And they arranged it by returning Italy to the state of a geographical expression. They did not give it even as much unity as they gave Germany, not even that of a loose confederation. They made short shrift of all such suggestions and restored most of the old states. There were henceforth ten of them: Piedmont, Lombardy-Venetia, Parma, Modena, Lucca, Tuscany, the Papal States, Naples, Monaco, and San Marino. Genoa and Venice, until recently independent republics, were not restored, as republics were not "fashionable." The one was given to Piedmont, the other to Austria.

The ten Italian states.

These states were too small to be self-sufficient, and as

ITALY
1815 - 1859
Scale of English Miles
0 20 40 60 80 100
K'g'd of Sardinia
Parma
Modena
Lucca
Tuscany
States of the Church
K'g'd of the Two Sicilies
SWITZERLAND
Lausanne
Geneva
Simplon
St Gothard Pass
Longitude East 12 from Greenwich
Lombardy
MILAN
Venetia
Venice
Verona
Padua
Trieste
Udine
Carniola
Laibach
Agram
Drave R.
Save R.
Brod
Belgrade
AUSTRIAN EMPIRE
Croatia
Dalmatia
TURKEY
Bosna Serai
Montenegro
Cettigne
Ragusa
Cattaro
Budua
Scutari
Lissa
Sebenico
Spalato
Zara
Fiume
Pola
Istria
Adriatic Sea
Ionian Sea
Durazzo
Avlona
Corfu
Otranto
Brindisi
Taranto
Bari
Foggia
Basilicata
Calabria
Castrovillari
Paola
Cosenza
Nicotera
Monteleone
Gerace
Aspromonte
Reggio
Messina
Milazzo
Lipari Ids
PALERMO
Monreale
Bagheria
Termini
Trapani
Favignana
Marsala
Salemi
Sciacca
Girgenti
Licata
Terranova
Caltanissetta
Catania
Etna
Taormina
Syracuse
Noto
Pantellaria
Tunis
KINGDOM OF SARDINIA
Savoy
Piedmont
Turin
Susa
Mt Cenis
Chambery
Aosta
Biella
Novara
Alessandria
Piacenza
Parma
Reggio
Modena
Ferrara
Bologna
Ravenna
Romagna
Marche
Ancona
Castel Fidardo
Rimini
S. Marino
Pesaro
Urbino
Pistoja
Florence
Lucca
Pisa
Leghorn
Arezzo
Siena
Cortona
Perugia
Foligno
Ascoli
Fermo
Spoleto
Orvieto
Viterbo
Orbetello
Civitavecchia
ROME
Frascati
Tivoli
Terracina
Abruzzi
Teramo
Pescara
Sora
Molise
Pontecorvo
Gaeta
Garigliano
Capua
Caserta
Benevento
R. Volturno
NAPLES
Nola
Ischia
Capri
Salerno
Eboli
Avezzano
Genoa
Gulf of Genoa
Savona
Nice
Monaco
Marseilles
Toulon
Avignon
Grenoble
R. Isère
R. Rhône
R. Saône
Tarrarenian Sea
Corsica
Ajaccio
C. Corso
Elba
Caprera
G. of Terranova
Sassari
Sardinia
Cagliari
KINGDOM OF THE TWO SICILIES
STATES OF THE CHURCH

a result Italy was for nearly fifty years the sport of foreign powers, dependent, henceforth, not upon France but upon Austria. This is the cardinal fact in the situation and is an evidence, as it is a partial cause, of the commanding position of the Austrian monarchy after the fall of Napoleon. Austria was given outright the richest part of the Po valley as a Lombardo-Venetian kingdom. Austrian princes or princesses ruled over Modena, Parma, and Tuscany, and were easily brought into the Austrian system. Thus was Austria the master of northern Italy; master of southern Italy, too, for Ferdinand, King of Naples, made an offensive and defensive treaty with Austria, pledging himself to make no separate alliances and to grant no liberties to his subjects beyond those which obtained in Lombardy and Venetia. Naples was thus but a satellite in the great Austrian system. The King of Piedmont and the Pope were the only Italian princes at all likely to be intractable. And Austria's strength in comparison with theirs was that of a giant compared with that of a pigmy.

The dominance of Austria.

Thus the restoration was accomplished. Italy became again a collection of small states, largely under the dominance of Austria. Each of the restored princes was an absolute monarch. In none of the states was there a parliament. Italy had neither unity nor constitutional forms, nor any semblance of popular participation in the government. The use which the princes made of their unfettered liberty of action was significant.

Of these several states the four most important were: the Lombardo-Venetian Kingdom, the Kingdom of Sardinia or Piedmont, the Papal States, and the Kingdom of Naples.

The first was ruled by a viceroy, who carried out orders received from Vienna. It paid into the Austrian treasury taxes far out of proportion to its population or its extent. Here French laws were largely abrogated, and an attempt was made to make the people forget that they were Italians, and to consider themselves Austrians. Children were taught

The Lombardo-Venetian Kingdom.

in their text-books of geography that Lombardy and Venetia were geographically a part of Austria. Industries were repressed in favor of Austrian manufacturers. Austrians were appointed to the university professorships, and they and their students, as well as other persons, were watched by numerous and proficient spies. It was even considered necessary to edit Dante that he might be read with safety.

The Kingdom of Sardinia.

The King of Piedmont, Victor Emmanuel I, had been for many years an exile in the island of Sardinia, and his states had been annexed by Napoleon to France. He returned to Turin enraged against the author of all his woes. Saying jokingly that he had slept fifteen years, he resolved that Piedmont should regard the interval as a dream. Most of the laws and institutions introduced by France were abolished by a stroke of the pen, almost the only ones retained being those which the Piedmontese would gladly have seen go, the heaviest taxes and the police system. Most of those connected with the government and the army during the French period were removed from their positions, thus constituting at the outset a disaffected class. Religious liberty was narrowly circumscribed; political liberty did not exist, nor did liberty of education. The universities were shortly placed under the control of the Jesuits, and professors and students were spied upon. Some of the deeds of reaction were so absurd as to become classical illustrations of the stupidity of the restored princes. Gas illumination of the Turin theater was abandoned because it had been introduced by the French. French plants in the Botanic Gardens of Turin were torn up, French furniture in the royal palaces destroyed, and a certain custom house official would let no merchandise be brought over the new Napoleonic road over the Mont Cenis pass, lest revolutionary ideas might thus be smuggled in. But, however unwise and retrogressive this government might be, it followed in foreign affairs a policy of independence of Austrian influence as far as this was possible. Piedmont was a military state, having an army

altogether disproportionate to its size. Indeed, three-fourths of the revenues of the state went to the support of the army and navy.

The States of the Church.

The Papal States were peculiar among the governments of Europe. The Pope was their ruler. The Government was in the hands of the priests. Over each of the provinces and legations was a prelate. All the higher officials were of the clergy. The laity were admitted only to the lower positions. Taxes were high, yet papal finances were badly disorganized, and the Government had difficulty in meeting running expenses. An important source of income of this Christian, priestly state was the lottery, which was administered with religious ceremonies, and was even kept running Sundays. The Government could not even assure the personal safety of its citizens. Brigandage was rife, and the Pope was forced finally to make a formal treaty with the brigands, by which they were to give themselves up as prisoners for a year, after which they were to be pensioned. Though bigoted and corrupt, the Government had a keen scent for the evils of the French régime. It repealed most of the French laws, and even forbade vaccination and gas illumination, as odious reminders of that people. The police were numerous and vexatious, paying particular attention to what one of their documents characterized as "the class called thinkers." The Inquisition was restored and judicial torture revived. Education was controlled by the clergy. Even in the universities most of the professors were ecclesiastics and the curriculum was carefully purged of all that might be dangerous. This excluded, among other subjects, modern literature and political economy. Niebuhr, the German historian, thus recorded his impression of that state: "No land of Italy, perhaps of Europe, excepting Turkey, is ruled as is this ecclesiastical state." Rome was called "a city of ruins, both material and moral."

The Kingdom of the Two Sicilies.

In the south, covering three-eighths of the peninsula, was the Kingdom of Naples, or the Two Sicilies. The king,

Ferdinand I, was of the Spanish Bourbon line. He was incredibly ignorant, and in character detestable. Returning from Sicily, however, he did not imitate his contemporaries by abolishing everything French. "Civil institutions," says a recent historian, "had advanced four centuries in the nine years of French rule."[1] But while in theory much of the work of those years was allowed to remain, in practice the Government was hopelessly corrupt. The King's treatment of the army was such as to raise up in it many enemies to his power. Many who had served under Murat were cashiered. Whipping was restored, which angered the common soldier. Thus there grew up rapidly a military faction ripe for revolt.

Universal reaction.

Obviously the policy of the various princes, as just described, made many enemies: all the progressive elements of the population who believed in freedom in education, in religion, in business, and who saw special privileges restored, obsolete commercial regulations revived, arbitrary and ignorant government substituted for the freer and more intelligent administration of the French; and all those thrown out of employment in the civil service or the army. The malcontents joined the Carbonari, a secret society which first rose in the Kingdom of Naples, spreading thence over Italy and to other European countries. Their weapons were conspiracy and insurrection. In a country where no parliaments, no political parties, no public agitation for political ends were permitted, such activity was necessarily driven into secret channels.

The Carbonari.

The Carbonari had an elaborate but loose and ineffective organization. Their rules and forms were frequently childish and absurd. Their purposes were not clear or definite. They were a vast liberal organization much better adapted for spasmodic movements of destruction than for the construction of new institutions. Into this society poured the dissatisfied of every class. It was a revolutionary leaven working in Italian society, spread-

[1] King, History of Italian Unity, I, 87.

ing abroad a hatred of the restored princes, a desire for change.

The Revolution of 1820 in Naples.

Among a people living under such depressing conditions the news of the successful and bloodless Spanish Revolution of 1820 spread quickly. It was the spark to the tinder. In Naples a military insurrection broke out, of such apparent strength that the King yielded at once. The revolutionists demanded the Spanish Constitution of 1812, not because they knew much about it save that it was very democratic but because it possessed the advantage of being ready-made. The King conceded the demand, saying that he would have been glad to have granted a constitution before had he only known there was a general desire for one. He was apparently as enthusiastic as were the revolutionists. He went out of his way to show this in a most extraordinary fashion. On July 13, 1820, having heard mass in the royal chapel, he approached the altar, took the oath, and then, fixing his eyes upon the cross, he added of his own accord, "Omnipotent God, who with infinite penetration lookest into the heart and into the future, if I lie, or if I should one day be faithless to my oath, do Thou at this instant annihilate me." It seemed as if the era of constitutional government had come for more than a third of Italy.

THE CONGRESSES

Thus in 1820 the Revolution, so hateful to the diplomats of 1815, had resumed the offensive. Spain and Naples had overthrown the régime that had been in force five years, and had adopted constitutions that were thoroughly saturated with the principles and mechanism of Revolutionary France. There had likewise been a revolution against the established régime in Portugal. There was shortly to be one in Piedmont.

A matter of greater importance than the attitude of these peoples toward their governments was that of the governments toward the peoples. The powers had united

The powers prepare to suppress these revolutions.

to put down Napoleon. They had then taken every precaution to check the activity of so-called French principles. They had been in the main successful, but now those principles were asserting themselves triumphantly in outlying parts of Europe. It had been thought that future trouble would come from France; but, instead, it was coming from Spain and Italy.

Metternich, the most influential personage in Europe, had very clear views of the requirements of the situation. "The malady," as he called it, the unrest of the times, was not local or peculiar to one part of Europe, to any single country. To suppress this malady the Great Coalition had been built up which, after endless suffering and sacrifice, had overcome it, though it had not extirpated it. What it had cost so much to check, must be kept in check. The vitality of these subversive revolutionary principles was evident to all. Energetic measures were necessary and, to be successful, they must be applied everywhere and at all times. If a monarch in one state yielded to revolution the effects were not limited to that state or that monarch, but the revolutionary parties everywhere were encouraged and the stability of every throne, of the established order everywhere, was threatened. This was conspicuously shown by the recent events. A revolution in Spain encourages a revolution in Naples. The movement may spread northward sympathetically, may reach the Italian possessions of Austria, may reach Austria itself, France, and the other countries, and the world, supposed to have been quieted at Vienna, will riot once more in anarchy. Metternich thus showed that no state can in the modern age lead an isolated life. The life of Europe henceforth must be collective and anything that threatens its peace is a very proper subject for the discussion of Europe, collected in congresses.

The doctrine of the right of intervention.

Metternich in this way developed the doctrine of the "right of intervention," a doctrine new in international law, yet one to which he succeeded in giving great vitality for many

years. The doctrine was that, as modern Europe was based upon opposition to revolution, the powers had the right and were in duty bound to intervene to put down revolution not only in their own states respectively but in any state of Europe, against the will of the people of that state, even against the will of the sovereign of that state, in the interests of the established monarchical order. A change of government within a given state was not a domestic but an international affair.

The Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle, 1818.

This doctrine did not originate in 1820. The principle was clearly laid down in the treaty of Quadruple Alliance of 1815 as far as France was concerned. It had been elaborated at the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1818. There the five Great Powers had declared their purpose to maintain the general peace which was "founded on a religious respect for the engagements contained in the Treaties, and for the whole of the rights resulting therefrom." The phrase was vague because the powers could not agree on anything more definite. How much did it mean or might it be made to mean? Would revolutionary movements in any country be considered as justifying intervention in the interests of the sacred treaties? The opportunity to test the matter had now arisen. Metternich, as usual, was quite equal to the occasion.

The Congress of Troppau, 1820.

A congress was called at Troppau to consider the affairs of the Kingdom of Naples. Austria, Russia, Prussia, France, and England were represented. Unanimity was lacking but there was a majority for the ominous principle. The three eastern powers, Russia, Prussia, and Austria, absolute monarchies, now formally accepted the principle of intervention as laid down by Metternich. They would refuse to recognize as legal changes brought about in any state by revolution, even if the king of that state himself consented. They asserted their right to intervene to overthrow any such changes, first by using conciliatory methods, then by using force. This probably meant an immediate armed intervention wherever and whenever revolution might

break out. And the right so to intervene was held to be implicit in the treaties of 1815 on which the European system rested. From this view England dissented vigorously, declaring that in her opinion the powers by those treaties intended to guarantee to each other only their territorial possessions, not at all their form of government. That was a domestic concern. England and France, though not signing the new declaration, remained, however, merely passive and the absolute monarchies had their way.

The Congress of Laibach, 1821.

Having established the principle the Congress next decided to apply it to the Kingdom of Naples. They accordingly adjourned to Laibach, inviting the King of Naples to meet them there. The Neapolitan Parliament was opposed to letting him leave the kingdom and only finally consented after he had again sworn to the constitution, and had with facile duplicity declared that he wished to go solely to intercede for his people and "to obtain the sanction of the powers for the newly acquired liberties." Falsehoods with Ferdinand I were redundant and superfluous. "I declare to you," he said, "and to my nation that I will do everything to leave my people in the possession of a wise and free constitution." Parliament, deceived by the royal mendacity, permitted him to go. No sooner was he out of his realm than he retracted all his promises and oaths and appealed to the Allies to restore him to absolute power, which was precisely what they had already determined to do. Austria was commissioned to send an army into the kingdom. It did so. The opposition of the Neapolitans was ineffective and Ferdinand was restored to absolutism by foreigners in 1821. He broke his return journey at Florence in order to make the *amende honorable* to a probably outraged Deity by placing a votive lamp in the Church of the Annunciation.

The political results were for the Neapolitans most deplorable. The reaction that ensued was unrestrained. Hundreds were imprisoned, exiled, executed. Arbitrary govern-

ment of the worst kind was henceforth meted out to this unfortunate kingdom.

Just as this Neapolitan revolution was being snuffed out an insurrection blazed forth at the opposite end of the peninsula, in Piedmont. The causes of this movement were discontent at the stupid reaction of the last five years, the desire for constitutional government, and dislike of Austria. The insurgents were led to believe that they would have the support of Charles Albert, Prince of Carignan, head of a younger branch of the royal family and heir presumptive to the crown, as his relations with Liberals were known to be intimate. His political importance was considered great owing to his nearness to the throne. As the king, Victor Emmanuel I, had no son, the crown would upon his death pass to his brother, Charles Felix, and upon the latter's death, he, too, being without direct heir, Charles Albert would himself become king.

The Revolution in Piedmont.

The Piedmontese revolution broke out in Alessandria on March 10, 1821. The revolutionists demanded the Spanish Constitution and war against Austria as the great enemy of Piedmont and of Italy. The King wavered for several days. He did not wish a civil war, Piedmontese fighting Piedmontese, which would surely come if he should refuse the demands and attempt to put down the movement. On the other hand, he knew that if he should grant those demands, the powers would intervene to suppress constitutionalism here as they had done in Naples and his promises would have been in vain. Unable to decide between the cruel alternatives of civil war or foreign intervention and conquest, and discovering no other course to follow, he abdicated on March 13, in favor of his brother Charles Felix. As the latter was not in Piedmont at the time, Charles Albert was appointed regent, until his arrival. Charles Albert, therefore, exercised the royal power for the moment and in a manner favorable to the revolutionists. He allowed the Spanish Constitution to be proclaimed from the royal palace in Turin

"with such modifications as His Majesty, in agreement with the national representation, shall consider advisable." The new King shortly disavowed these concessions. The whole imbroglio was cut short by the action of the powers. An Austrian army was already on the borders and a hundred thousand Russians were ordered forward from Galicia. The revolutionists clashed at Novara with an army composed of Austrians and Piedmontese loyal to the King. They were easily routed and the revolution was over. Charles Felix, an absolutist king, was upon the throne, and Austria had again shown her resolution and her power. Once more the demand for constitutional freedom had been suppressed, once more Metternich had triumphed.

Reasons for the failure of the movements of 1820.

Thus both the Italian movements for a freer political life had ended in disaster. The reasons for their failure are instructive and are important for an understanding of the Italian problem. The Neapolitan revolution failed because of the European coalition forbidding its success, because of the treachery of the King, because of the illiberal treatment of Sicily by the revolutionists. That of Piedmont failed because it was the work of a small clique, had no broad basis of appeal to the people, lacked leadership and definite aims, neglected details, and also because of the opposition of the powers.

Thus two revolutions had been overcome and the system of the Congress of Vienna preserved in Italy. There remained the more remote problem of Spain. The principle there, however, was the same and the Allies felt obliged to assert it. This was the work of the Congress of Verona. The revolution in Spain was still triumphant. The King and the reactionary parties could not by their own strength regain their old position. They appealed to the allied monarchs and by 1822 they, thoroughly committed to the policy involved, decided at the Congress of Verona, that Russia, Austria, Prussia, and France, should send to their ministers in Madrid identical notes demanding the immediate restora-

The Congress of Verona.

tion of Ferdinand VII to the fulness of his powers. In the event of the expected refusal the ministers should quit Madrid and war should be declared. England opposed this policy with high indignation, but in vain. France, now a thoroughly reactionary country, was commissioned to carry out the work of restoring Ferdinand. The Spaniards refused to accede to the demand of the powers, and in April 1823 a French army of a hundred thousand under the Duke of Angoulême, heir presumptive to the French throne, crossed the Pyrenees. The Spanish Government had no army and no money and could not oppose the advance of the invaders with any vigor. The French spent six months in traversing the peninsula from north to south, meeting no serious resistance. The Cortes retired from Madrid to Cadiz before the invaders, taking the King with them. The siege of Cadiz was now begun. The war was soon over with the seizure of the fort of the Trocadero and Ferdinand was back upon his absolute throne, by act of France, supported by the Holy Alliance.

Reaction in Spain.

There now began a period of odious reaction. All the acts passed by the Cortes since 1820 were annulled. An organization called the "Society of the Exterminating Angel" began a mad hunt for Liberals, throwing them into prison, shooting them down. The war of revenge knew no bounds. "Juntas of purification" helped it on. Thousands were driven from the country, hundreds were executed. The French Government, ashamed of its protégé, endeavored to stop the savagery, but with slight success. It is an odious chapter in the history of Spain.

The triumph of the Holy Alliance.

The Holy Alliance by these triumphs in Naples, Piedmont, and Spain, showed itself the dominant force in European politics. The system, named after Metternich, because his diplomacy had built it up and because he stood in the very center of it, seemed firmly established as the European system. But it had achieved its last notable triumph. It was now to receive a series of checks that were to limit it forever.

Against the decisions of the congresses we have passed in review, one power, England, had protested, though to no effect. England's prestige had steadily declined since the Congress of Vienna. The three eastern powers simply filed her protests against their intentions in their archives, paying no further heed. England, which had driven the French out of Spain ten years before, now saw them coming in again, this time with ease and success. As England's influence abroad decreased the wrath of Englishmen grew, and with the advent of Canning to the cabinet England delivered some swift blows in retaliation, showing that she was still a power to be reckoned with. It was, of course, useless for her to think of opposing the three great military monarchies by arms. But the contest between her and them was now removed to a field where her authority would unquestionably prove decisive.

Having restored the King of Spain to absolute power, the next wish of the Holy Alliance was to restore to Spain, and thus to monarchy, the revolted Spanish-American colonies. England let it be known that she would oppose any steps having this end in view, save those of the Spaniards themselves, and, as she controlled the sea, her declaration virtually was that she would keep the Holy Alliance restricted to the continent of Europe and would prevent it from sending ships and troops to the scene of the revolt. She sought and received the co-operation of the United States in this purpose, though no alliance was formed and each power acted independently. The United States had approved the secession of the countries to the south of her, so plainly to her advantage and so evidently in imitation of her example. This Government had also in 1819 virtually forced Spain to cede Florida, hitherto a Spanish possession. And now, just after the close of the successful French invasion and the restoration of Ferdinand, the President of the United States, James Monroe, in a message to Congress destined to become one of the most famous documents ever written

The Monroe Doctrine.

in the White House, gave emphatic notice to the Holy Alliance of the attitude this country would assume in case it should endeavor to win back her colonies for Spain, should Spain herself be unable to do so. We should consider any attempt on the part of these absolute monarchies of Europe "to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety," and we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing the South American states "or controlling in any other manner, their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition towards the United States." These suggestions from England and the United States were sufficient to prevent the summoning of any new congress to consider the reconquest of America and thus to add new laurels to the Holy Alliance. The doctrine of intervention had reached its high water mark as applied to the interests of reaction, had received an emphatic defiance—a defiance made the more resounding by the recognition shortly by England and the United States of the independence of the South American republics. Austria, Russia, and Prussia protested against a course which "tended to encourage that revolutionary spirit it had been found so difficult to control in Europe." Canning proudly said, "We have called in the New World to redress the balance of the Old." On the other hand, Metternich's opinion of Canning was that he was a "malevolent meteor hurled by an angry Providence upon Europe."

The Metternich system, thus checked, was to receive before long a series of blows from which it never recovered, in the overthrow of the restored Bourbons in France, in the Belgian revolution of 1830, and, in a certain way, in the Greek war of independence.

The "Metternich system" checked.

CHAPTER IV

FRANCE DURING THE RESTORATION

THE REIGN OF LOUIS XVIII

The profound effects of the French Revolution.

No country in Europe had undergone between 1789 and 1815 so sweeping and so vital a transformation as had France, the birthplace of the Revolution and still the home of its unrealized ideals. Institutions, feelings, aspirations, mental outlook of a kind quite new in Europe, had been adopted by millions of Frenchmen as a new evangel. Much had been irrevocably destroyed by the Revolution, much had been created, much had been merely sketched. It remained for the nineteenth century to fill in this outline. The old form of society to which France had been accustomed for centuries was gone and a type new to Europe, of immense proselytizing power, had been unfolded. The old had been one of privileged classes. The new was democratic. The three great institutions, agencies of the privileged few, which had long weighed down with paralyzing effect upon the mass of Frenchmen, the monarchy, the nobility, and the church, had been brought into subjection to the people, had been weakened immeasurably as controlling forces in the life of modern France. France had made a passionate effort to free herself from all forms of aristocracy, temporal and ecclesiastical. France in 1815 was by far the most democratic country in Europe, in her feelings, her thoughts, her customs, and her institutions.

These changes had, however, not been brought about by the unanimous consent of the French people. The old privileged classes were, from the very nature of the case, sworn enemies of the new order which had been erected at their

expense, and it was precisely because men were not agreed as to the permanence of the principles and decisions of the Revolution that the contest between the adherents of the old and the supporters of the new was to be carried over into the new era, and indeed still continues. The war of opinions which began with the Revolution was not ended in 1795 or in 1815, nor has it entirely ended yet, for the reason that not all Frenchmen have at any time been ready to accept the present fact, the status quo, but have tried repeatedly to re-open the discussion, and to modify, if not to reverse, the decision. This warfare is the warp and woof of French history in the nineteenth century.

The restoration of the Bourbons not a restoration of the old régime.

One thing, however, was settled at the outset. The old régime was not to be restored. The Bourbons recovered the right to rule only on condition that their monarchy should be a constitutional one. The Allies who, as the phrase ran, had "brought back the Bourbons in their baggage," insisted on this, believing it the only means of assuring the continuance of their rule, and Louis XVIII, rather than have a constitution forced upon him by the representatives of the French people, granted one himself. This procedure had the manifest advantage for him that he did not appear to receive his throne from the people on conditions imposed by them, that he did not at all recognize the revolutionary principle of popular sovereignty, that he appeared to rule solely by right of birth, by divine right, as had his ancestors. In the plenitude of his powers he would graciously grant certain privileges to his people. The monarchical principle would remain unblemished. Consequently, on his first return to France in 1814, he issued the most famous document connected with his name, the Constitutional Charter, which, suspended later during the Hundred Days, was revived in 1815 and remained in force until 1848, under three kings, Louis XVIII (1815-1824), Charles X (1824-1830), and Louis Philippe (1830-1848), only altered in some details in 1830 as a result of the revolution of that year.

The Constitutional Charter.

The form of government. By this act the King decreed that his own person should be inviolable, that his ministers might be impeached by the chambers, that he alone should possess all executive power, that he should command the army and navy, declare war, make treaties, and appoint to all positions in the public services; that the legislative power should be exercised by himself and a legislature consisting of two houses, a Chamber of Peers and a Chamber of Deputies; that the king alone should propose all laws; that they then should be discussed by the chambers and accepted or rejected according to their desire, but not amended save with his consent. If he should not propose a law desired by the chambers they might petition him to do so and might suggest the provisions they would like to see it contain, but if the king should reject this petition it should not be again presented during the same session. No tax could be levied without the consent of the chambers.

A restricted suffrage. The Chamber of Peers was to be appointed by the king for life, or for hereditary transmission, as he might see fit. Its sessions were to be secret. The Chamber of Deputies was to consist of representatives chosen for a period of five years. The suffrage was carefully restricted by an age and property qualification. Only those who were at least thirty years of age and paid at least three hundred francs in direct taxes should have the right to vote for deputies, and only those were eligible to become deputies who were forty years of age or over and paid a direct tax of at least one thousand francs. These provisions were very favorable to the wealthy. Indeed, they made the chamber a plutocratic body. There were less than 100,000 voters in France out of a population of 29,000,000, and not more than 12,000 were eligible to become deputies.

The Charter proclaimed the equality of all Frenchmen, yet only a petty minority were given the right to participate in the government of the country. France was still in a political sense a land of privilege, only privilege was no

longer based on birth but on fortune. Nevertheless, this was a more liberal form of government than she had ever had under Napoleon, and was the most liberal to be seen in Europe, outside of England. The number of voters and of those eligible as deputies increased with the increase of wealth. The influence of English example is apparent in many of the provisions of the Charter.

Provisions concerning civil rights.

There was another set of provisions in this document of even greater importance than those determining the future form of government, namely, that in which the civil rights of Frenchmen were narrated. These provisions show how much of the work of the Revolution and of Napoleon the Bourbons were prepared to accept. They were intended to reassure the people of France, who feared to see in the Restoration a loss of liberties or rights which had become most precious to them. They were thus intended to win for the restored monarchy a popular support and a guarantee of permanence it thus far lacked. It was declared that all Frenchmen were equal before the law, whatever their titles or rank, and thus the cardinal principle of the Revolution was preserved; that all were equally eligible to civil and military positions, that thus no class should monopolize public service, as had largely been the case before the Revolution; that no one should be arrested or prosecuted save by due process of law, that thus the day of arbitrary imprisonment was not to return; that there should be complete religious freedom for all sects, though Roman Catholicism was declared to be the religion of the state; that the press should be free "while conforming to the laws which are necessary to restrain abuses of that liberty"—a phrase suspiciously elastic. Those who had purchased the confiscated property of the crown, the church, and the nobles, during the Revolution were assured that their titles were inviolable. The Napoleonic nobility was placed on an equality with the old nobility of France, and the king might create new peers at will, but nobility was henceforth simply

Recognition of the work of the Revolution.

a social title carrying with it no privileges and no exemptions from taxation or the other burdens of the state.[1]

Such were the concessions that Louis XVIII was willing to make to the spirit of the times and the demands of the people. They constituted an open recognition of the fact that the France of 1815 was not to be a restoration of the France of 1789. Certain phrases of the Charter gave offense, but they were mainly those of the preamble in which the King labored to maintain the claim of the divine right of monarchy and to connect his act with medieval precedents. These phrases were far-fetched and curiously archaic, but the fact remained that with all its limitations the Charter granted France a larger portion of self-government than it had enjoyed before, except during a brief period in the Revolution. And it put the Bourbon monarchy on record as recognizing the principal results of the democratic evolution of society. The Restoration started out by accepting the centralized administrative system, the great law codes, the concordat, and the nobility of Napoleon, and the social organization created by the Revolution.

The political condition of France after 1815 was exceedingly troubled. The nation was divided into several parties whose animosity toward each other had only been embittered by the Hundred Days. Louis XVIII, restored for a second time by the victorious enemies of France, was eminently qualified to calm the seething passions of his countrymen and lead them in the necessary work of recuperation. He was naturally a man of moderate opinions. A thorough believer in the divine right of monarchs and asserting the belief with fervor, he was, however, too clear-sighted to think that monarchy of the type historic in France could be restored. He saw as clearly as any one in the realm the greatness of the changes that had latterly been effected in France, and that

Louis XVIII, 1755-1824.

[1] The Charter may be found in full in Anderson, Constitutions and Documents, No. 93, or in Univ. of Penn. Translations and Reprints, Vol. 1, No. 3.

his very throne would be imperiled if he attempted to undo any of the important work of the Revolution. He willingly granted a constitution to his people, sharing with them the power which his ancestors had wielded alone. He preferred to rule as a constitutional king than not to rule at all. He had known the bitterness of the exile's life too well to desire to be compelled to "resume his travels" owing to any illiberal conduct on his part. The throne was for him only the "softest of chairs." Cold-blooded, skeptical, free from illusions, free from the passion of revenge, indolent by nature, he desired to avoid conflicts and to enjoy his power in peace. His policy, which from the beginning he attempted to carry out, was expressed by himself a few years later in these words: "The system which I have adopted . . . is based on the maxim that it will never do to be the king of two peoples, and to the ultimate fusion of these—for their distinction is only too real—all the efforts of my government are directed."

The difficulties of his situation.

The personality of the King seemed, therefore, admirably adapted for the problem that confronted France in 1815. But there were difficulties in the situation that foreboded trouble. Louis XVIII had been restored by foreign armies. His presence on the throne was a constant reminder of the humiliation of France. Moreover, his strength lay not in himself but in the historic rôle of his house, in immemorial prescription, and the power of mere custom over the French mind had been greatly lessened during the past twenty-five years. But a more serious feature was his environment. The court was now composed of the nobles who had suffered greatly from the Revolution, who had been robbed of their property, driven from the country, who had seen many of their relatives executed by the guillotine. It was but natural that these men should have come back full of hatred for the authors of their woes, that they should detest the ideas of the Revolution and the persons who had been identified with it. These men were not free from passion, as was

Louis XVIII. More eager to restore the former glory of the crown, the former rank of the nobility and the clergy, more bitter toward the new ideas than the King himself, they were the Ultra-royalists, or Ultras—men more royalist than the King, as they claimed. They saw in the Revolution only robbery and sacrilege and gross injustice to themselves. They bitterly assailed Louis XVIII for granting the Charter, a dangerous concession to the Revolution, and they secretly wished to abolish it, meanwhile desiring to nullify its liberal provisions as far as possible. They constituted the party of the Right. Their leader was the Count of Artois, brother of Louis XVIII, who, the King being childless, stood next in line of succession. These men, not very numerous, but very clamorous, formed the natural entourage of the monarch. The matter of most pressing importance to France was what power of resistance the King would show to this resolute and revengeful band. Would he in the end give way to them or would he be able to control them?

The Ultras.

The other parties in France in 1815 were shortly differentiated. There was the party of the Left. This was not so much a coherent group as a conglomeration of the disaffected. It included those who believed in a republic, who, however, were for some time so few as to be a negligible quantity. It also included the adherents of Napoleon. This class was numerous and composed chiefly of old soldiers who saw themselves, the glory of the Napoleonic state, now degraded, put on half-pay, thrown into the background. These radical and discontented elements were opposed to the very existence of the Bourbon monarchy. But they were hopelessly discredited by the abuses and the failures of both the Republic and the Empire.

The Center parties.

There were two other parties, called the Right Center and the Left Center. They comprised the body of moderate men who stood between the two extremes and were opposed to both. They were united by one bond—common loyalty to the Charter which the King had granted. They were the

convinced supporters of the constitutional régime, but they differed from each other in their interpretation of what the Charter should mean. The Right Center accepted it as a finality, to be carried out honestly and to the letter. The Left Center believed in its honest execution, but also believed that, while the Charter should be thus observed, men should work for its further expansion, that as the years went by larger constitutional liberty should be accorded to the people. The Charter was for them not a finality but a stepping-stone. But further progress should be attempted only slowly and after full reflection. Of these four parties, two were distinctly unconstitutional—the Ultras and the Radicals or Left. The former, professing a momentary lip service to the Charter, were resolved to alter it as soon as possible in fundamental and comprehensive ways. They were in principle opposed to a written constitution. They wished to restore the absolute authority of the king and the former privileged positions of clergy and nobility. The Charter stood bluntly in the way. Consequently, however much they might dissemble, they favored its ultimate abrogation. The Radicals favored its destruction for the opposite reason—that the Republic or the Empire might be restored, the Revolution made triumphant once more. The two middle parties were the friends of the new régime.

The White Terror.

The events of the first year seemed to show the great power of the Ultras. Reaction set in fast and furiously in 1815. There occurred a series of outrages that have come down in history as the White Terror, in contradistinction to the Red Terror of the Revolution. Immediately after the battle of Waterloo rioting broke out in Marseilles, led by Royalists, and resulting in much plundering and many murders. The movement spread to other departments in the south. Religious motives were added to the political, as the Protestants, particularly numerous in the south, had been strongly attached to the Revolution and to Napoleon and had welcomed the return of the latter from Elba. The white

flag of the Bourbons was disgraced by these atrocities committed by Royalists. The Government was in no sense the cause of them, but it was criminally negligent in not trying to repress them.

With the meeting of the first legislative chambers this campaign of revenge and reaction became systematic and frenzied. The Chamber of Deputies was overwhelmingly Ultra-royalist, elected, as it had been, amid the terror and demoralization of the crashing Empire. It demanded satisfaction for the treachery of the Hundred Days. As a result Marshal Ney, "the bravest of the brave," and other distinguished French soldiers, were condemned to death and shot—an everlasting disgrace to the Bourbon monarchy. The Chamber demanded repressive measures of various kinds from the King and got them. It demanded still more violent ones which the King would not concede. The dissension between the Moderate Royalists, represented by the King, the ministry, and the Chamber of Peers, on the one hand, and the Ultras, represented by the Count of Artois and the Chamber of Deputies on the other, soon reached a climax. The King himself said bitterly, "If these gentlemen had full liberty, they would end by purging even me." The representatives of the foreign governments intervened to say that so unreasonable a reaction must cease, in the interest of the stability of the Bourbon monarchy and of the peace of Europe. They feared that the revolutionary elements of France would break out again, stung by such insane legislation. The Ultras even went so far as to reject the budget, a blazing indiscretion, as it offended all who were financially interested in France, foreigners and Frenchmen. The King now took a decisive step, prorogued the Chamber, and then dissolved it. He then appealed to the people to return a moderate Chamber. The appeal was wholly successful and this mad reaction was speedily brought to a close. The Ultra majority was swept away and a large majority of Moderate Royalists was returned. France

Louis XVIII checks the Ultras.

had weathered her first crisis in parliamentary government, but the temper of the Ultras had been shown with the vividness of lightning. France had had emphatic warning of the danger that would lie in the triumph of that party.

A period of moderate liberalism.

From 1816 to 1820 the Government of France was able to advance along more liberal lines. The two chief ministers, Richelieu and Decazes, both convinced adherents of the Bourbon monarchy, were men who saw the utter folly of attempts at reaction such as those just witnessed and who believed that the pressing needs of France were very different from those of a faction bent on revenge. The two Centers now controlled Parliament, and for several years worked in harmony with the King.

They accomplished much for the rehabilitation of France. In 1815, it will be recalled, the Allies had imposed a large war indemnity on France, and had insisted that she support an army of occupation of 150,000 in eighteen fortresses of the northern and eastern departments for a minimum of three, a maximum of five, years. This was a great financial burden and a greater humiliation. The liberation of the soil of the foreign armies was a task which the King and the ministry had very much at heart. To effect this the people had to make great sacrifices, for before it could be accomplished the national credit must be re-established and to effect this Frenchmen must pay higher taxes. This they did, and France proceeded to pay off the immense war indemnity more rapidly that the powers that had imposed it had expected would be possible. By 1817 the Allies agreed to withdraw thirty thousand of their troops, and at the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1818 they agreed to withdraw the remainder before the close of that year. Thus the outward evidence of the appalling national humiliation was removed. "I can die at peace," said Louis XVIII, "since I shall see France free and the French flag floating over every city of France." France was, for the first time since 1815,

The liberation of the territory.

mistress in her own house. The foreign ambassadors ceased their weekly meetings in Paris, designed for the drafting of advice to be given to the French Government. The foreign tutelage was over.

Reorganization of the army.

The reorganization of the army was undertaken at this time. The military power of France had been sadly shattered in the general downfall of the Napoleonic system. The army was reduced to a few corps kept up by voluntary enlistment. Now that the foreign troops were to be withdrawn and France was to resume her full place in international affairs it was necessary to create an army that should command respect. There were, however, difficulties in the way. A large army could not be raised by volunteering. And yet forced military service had become, under Napoleon, so hateful a burden that it had been expressly forbidden in the Charter. A combination of the two methods lay at the basis of the new law. Voluntary enlistments were still to furnish the bulk of the army. If these should not be sufficient recourse should be had to compulsion to complete the corps. All young men of twenty years of age should draw lots. The "bad numbers" alone would be forced to serve for six years. Forty thousand might thus by these two processes be enrolled every year. Having served in the active army six years, they should pass into the reserve army for six years more. This reserve should be used only in defense of the soil of France, should not be ordered out of the country. It was estimated that thus there would be an army of 240,000 men on a peace footing. Promotion was to be for service and merit and was to be equally open to all. The bill was violently opposed by the Ultras for the reason that it destroyed all hope of the nobility monopolizing the positions in the army. Their chances were simply the same as those of other men. The bill became law in 1818. Thus the basis of the military institutions was firmly laid. The army as thus constituted lasted with some alterations of detail down to 1868, surviving many violent changes in French history.

The electoral system.

On two other subjects this moderate ministry of Richelieu carried important legislation, the electoral system and the liberty of the press. Concerning both matters the Charter had merely laid down general principles, leaving the manner in which they should be applied to be determined by the legislature in special laws. A liberty so large enabled the legislature to determine the real character, the range, and effect of two fundamental privileges, and as the different parties soon saw that by framing the laws in this way, or in that, they could further their own interests, both matters became the subject of passionate contention in parliament all through the period of the Restoration, and laws very dissimilar in character and in effect were passed as first one party, then another, gained ascendency in the state. Moderates and Ultras differed on these questions as on others.

Concerning the electoral system, the ideas of the Moderates were shown in the law of 1817, passed by the Richelieu-Decazes ministry. The Charter merely stated the qualifications required of voters and of deputies. The manner in which the voters should elect the deputies was not defined. The law of 1817 established the system of the so-called general ticket (*scrutin de liste*); that is, the voters of each department should meet in the chief town of the department, and there elect all the deputies to which the department was entitled. This system favored the Moderates and Liberals, who belonged generally to the bourgeoisie, to the industrial and trading classes, largely an urban population, whereas the country gentlemen, the landed proprietors and their tenants, living in the country, were chiefly Ultras, members or adherents of the aristocracy of the old régime. Many of these found it difficult or expensive or annoying to make the trip to the chief town of the department, where alone they could cast their votes. Thus the law, which remained in force from 1817 to 1820, favored the Moderates as each succeeding election showed.

The press law of 1819. There was passed in 1819 a press law, much more liberal than that of the Napoleonic period, which had, in the main, been carried over into the first years of the Restoration. The censorship was abolished, and press cases were henceforth to be tried before juries. But even under this system newspapers were a luxury, enjoyed only by the rich and well-to-do, as they were not sold by the single copy but only to subscribers at a high price, and in addition there was a stamp tax on each copy of two cents, and a postage duty of one cent. Moreover, while freedom in establishing newspapers was guaranteed, as a matter of fact only the well-to-do could establish them, owing to the large preliminary deposit required of their proprietors, which was to serve as a guaranty fund for the payment of fines that might be inflicted as a result of damage suits.

Activity of the Ultras. But this body of liberal legislation rested upon an insecure basis, the favor of the King, and the coherence of the great mass of moderate men, the Centers. The Ultras did not relinquish their activity and were alert to seize upon every incident that might discredit the party in power. Nor had they long to wait. Events shortly occurred that aroused misgivings among the most timid of the Moderates, tending to drive them over to the Ultras, events, too, that shook the firmness of the King. According to the Charter there was to be a partial renewal of the Chamber of Deputies each year, one-fifth of that body passing out, and their places being filled by new elections. These elections showed a distinct trend in favor of the Radical party, or party of the Left. At the first renewal in 1817, twenty-five "independents" of the Left were returned; in 1818 the result was similar, the Left increasing to forty-five. Among them were Lafayette and Manuel, both prominent figures in the Revolution. Now the principles of the Left were not only liberal, but were largely anti-dynastic. While that wing acquiesced in the existence of the Bourbon monarchy, it might at any time become actively opposed to it.

Election of Grégoire.

The elections in 1819 added greatly to the growing Left—it numbering now ninety out of a total of 258. But more damaging than the number was the character of some of the members chosen, particularly of Grégoire. Grégoire had played a prominent rôle in the Revolution, having been a member of the Constituent Assembly and of the Convention. He had aided in the overthrow of the Roman Catholic Church. He had shown himself a fervid republican. A remark of his that kings are in the moral world what monsters are in the physical had had an immense notoriety, and was not yet forgotten. He was not a regicide, as he was absent from Paris at the time of the trial of Louis XVI, but he was, owing to his utterances, commonly considered one. No man was more odious to the Ultras and his election to the Chamber outraged their deepest feelings. Some of them had themselves helped bring about his election, believing that the triumph of so notable a revolutionary would help them in upsetting the mild policy of the ministry and bring about the longed-for reaction. In this they were largely right, as this election aroused consternation in the ranks of those who had hitherto been moderate, and drove many into the camp of the Ultras. The chief minister, Decazes, (Richelieu having previously resigned), was convinced that some change must be made in the policy of the Government. The Ultras raged against this "regicidal priest," declared that either he must yield to the dynasty or the dynasty to him, and in a stormy session and amid shouts of "Long live the King," voted his exclusion from the Chamber, to which he had been chosen. The freedom of elections was thus grossly violated, as well as the promise of the Charter that the past should be forgotten.

Murder of the Duke of Berry.

But an event far more damaging to the Moderates now occurred—the murder of the Duke of Berry. The Duke was the younger son of the Count of Artois, and as his elder brother, the Duke of Angoulême, had no heir, he was the hope of the dynasty. At about eleven o'clock on the even-

ing of February 13, 1820, as he was helping his wife into a carriage at the door of the Opera, he was violently attacked by a man, named Louvel, who plunged a dagger into his breast. The Duke died in the opera house at five o'clock, surrounded by the royal family, and demanding pardon for the murderer. The murderer desired to cut off the Bourbon line, which he thought he could do as the Duke had no children. His act was his own; he had no accomplices. But the Royalists at once asserted that the Liberal party was responsible and that anarchy was the natural result of the policy of liberalism. Their opposition was directed against the ministry under Decazes, whom they succeeded in forcing to resign. At his resignation Louis XVIII is said to have remarked, "It is over with me," meaning that from that time on his policy of reconciliation was over, that the party headed by the Count of Artois would control. This was virtually to be the case. In 1820 began the great royalist reaction, started in 1815, suspended from 1816 to 1820, when the more moderate policies prevailed, and destined now to last with but a single slight interruption until 1830, when it culminated in a new revolution.

Electoral law of 1820.

The Right, now in control, proceeded to undo much of the work of the preceding ministries. By the electoral law of 1820 that of 1817 was rescinded, and a new system brought into existence. The Chamber of Deputies was enlarged from 258 members to 430, an increase of 172. The electors of deputies were no longer to meet together in the chief town of the department and vote for all the deputies from that department, but were to be divided into as many groups or colleges as there were arrondissements or districts in the department. Each voter was therefore to vote for one deputy only, the one from his district. Thus the principle of single-member constituencies was adopted. This arrangement would be advantageous to the Ultras, as the country gentlemen and their tenants, supporters of that party, no longer having to make the journey to the chief

town, but enabled to vote at places nearer home, would come to the polls in larger numbers. In this way 258 members were to be chosen. The other 172 were to be elected in a special manner. At the chief town of each department were to meet one-fourth of the voters, those who paid the heaviest taxes, and they were to choose the additional 172. This method, of course, greatly augmented the power of the rich. It thus happened that about twelve thousand voters had the right to vote twice, once in the district and once in the department college, and similarly were twice represented—by the deputies chosen in both ways, in both of which elections they participated. Hence this electoral law of 1820 was called the law of the double vote. Moreover, the president of each electoral college was to be chosen by the central government and the voters must write out their ballots in his presence and hand them to him unfolded—an excellent device for enabling the Government to bring pressure upon them in favor of its candidates. This bill was hotly contested in the Chamber and outside. The debate was long and impassioned, participated in by over a hundred and twenty members. The principle of the law, the double vote, was adopted only by a majority of five. Hailed with enthusiasm by the Ultras it assured their ascendency. By 1824 the independents, or Radicals, numbered only seven.

The double vote.

The liberal press law of 1819 went the same way after a brief existence of ten months. It was rescinded. The censorship was restored. No journal could be founded without the Government's consent, no single issue could appear without the censor's permission, the Government might suspend its publication for six months, and even under certain conditions suppress it (1820). This control, which would appear sufficient, was strengthened two years later by an additional law which enabled the Government to suppress publications even for "tendencies" when no definite infraction of the law could be proved.

The censorship restored.

Armed with these powerful instruments for the control

of elections and of the organs of opinion and agitation, the Ultras pushed confidently forward, and their future appeared assured by the birth of a posthumous son of the Duke of Berry. They forced the King to send an army into Spain to restore Ferdinand VII to an absolute throne in the interests of the Holy Alliance (1823). They thus hoped to throw military glamor over the restored House of Bourbon, to efface by dazzling exploits the uncomfortable memory of those performed by Napoleon. Flushed with an easy victory in Spain, the Ultras resumed the policy of political and religious reaction at home with great enthusiasm.

French invasion of Spain.

Triumph of the Ultras.

Thinking that a new election of the Chamber of Deputies held during the war fever would result overwhemingly in its favor, the Villèle ministry (1822-1828) caused the existing Chamber to be dissolved and new elections to be ordered. They were held in February 1824, and resulted as desired in a sweeping triumph of the Ultras. Of the 430 deputies elected only fifteen were Liberals. This triumph had been achieved only by the grossest abuse of power on the part of the Government, which stopped at nothing to gain its ends. It even went so far as to relieve many prominent Liberals of taxes, so that they could not meet the tax qualification for voters or for membership in the Chamber.

A law was now passed decreeing that the new Chamber should last seven years, to be entirely reconstructed at the end of that time. This was an arbitrary change in the Charter.

The reactionary party, now overwhelmingly in the majority in the Chamber, and declaring that that Chamber should not be altered for seven years, thus lengthening the term and suppressing the annual partial renewal, considered that it could safely advance to the realization of its most cherished plans, too long held in abeyance. Their project was helped by the death in 1824 of Louis XVIII, and the accession to power of his brother, the Count of Artois, who assumed the title of Charles X. Charles had virtually directed the policy

Death of Louis XVIII.

of his brother for several years. His accession, however, would necessarily give it additional impetus. He needed only six years thoroughly to uproot the elder branch of the House of Bourbon.

THE REIGN OF CHARLES X

Charles X, 1757-1836.

The characteristics of the new King were well known. He was the convinced leader of the reactionaries in France from 1814 to 1830. He had been the constant and bitter opponent of his brother's liberalism, and had finally seen that liberalism forced to yield to the growing strength of the party which he led. He was not likely to abandon lifelong principles at the age of sixty-seven, and at the moment when he seemed about to be able to put them into force. Louis XVIII had made an honest effort to reconcile the two social régimes and systems into which Frenchmen were divided—the old pre-revolutionary régime and the new régime, the product of the Revolution, the old nobility and the modern middle class with its principle of equality before the law. The nobility had returned from abroad unchanged, with ideas of feudal privileges, with the determination to restore as much as possible of the old power of the landed aristocracy and of the church, faithful support of the monarchy by divine right. The policy of reconciliation had been badly shattered during the closing years of Louis XVIII's reign. With the accession of Charles X it was entirely abandoned, and that of restoration vigorously attempted. Not that this was proclaimed from the housetops. Charles rather at first attempted to reassure the somewhat perturbed mind of the nation. He announced his firm intention to support the Charter, and declared that all Frenchmen were, in his eyes, equal. He liberated political prisoners and won great applause by abolishing the censorship of the press. But these halcyon days were limited to the inauguration of the new Government. At the coronation of the King, France was treated to a spectacle of

Policy of the new King.

medieval mummery that impressed most unpleasantly a people that had for a generation been living in the positive realities of the modern spirit. It seemed the most incredible height of absurdity to see the King anointed on seven parts of his person with sacred oil, miraculously preserved, it was asserted, and dating from the time of Clovis. Nor could France, in the modern scientific atmosphere, gravely believe, as it was asked to, in the power of the king's touch. Béranger's witty poem on Charles the Simple was on everybody's lips.

The nobles indemnified for property confiscated during the Revolution.

But the legislation now brought forward by the King, and largely enacted, showed the belated political and social ideas of this Government. It was first proposed to grant nine hundred and eighty-eight million francs to the nobility whose lands had been confiscated during the Revolution and sold as " national property " to private individuals. The Charter explicitly assured the purchasers of this land that they should not be molested in their possession. But the courtiers, despite this assurance, were demanding the restoration of their estates to themselves. The King expressed the belief that by this act the last wounds of the Revolution would be closed. The émigrés should not receive their lands, but they should receive a money indemnification.

The debates on this proposal were heated. Many of the Ultra-royalists criticised it, saying that the sum proposed was entirely insufficient. Many rejected the very idea of indemnification, but demanded that the " stolen goods " themselves be given back. That there was an article in the Charter preventing this they did not consider a legitimate obstacle.

The Opposition, however, did not lack arguments. Had the descendants of those whose property had been seized after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes ever been indemnified? Had the émigrés suffered so much more than others from the Revolution that they alone should be compensated for their losses? It might be right to compensate those who had

had to flee from France to save their lives, but many of these émigrés who were now to help themselves out of the public treasury had fled voluntarily in order to bring about an invasion of France by foreigners, and, when that invasion had occurred, had themselves joined it and borne arms against France. Confiscation of property was a very proper punishment for such persons. Again, those who had remained at home and defended the fatherland had suffered as much as those who had emigrated and then invaded it. Furthermore, this measure would aid only the landed proprietors, but many fortunes, based upon personal property, had likewise been destroyed by the Revolution.

The bill passed (1825) and became law, though the Opposition in the Chamber of Deputies was larger than had been expected. Charles called it "an act of justice." It was perhaps wise in the sense that all purchasers of national domains, who, despite the assurance of the Charter, were constantly threatened, were henceforth safe. The value of these properties immediately rose in the market. But while the act pleased the émigrés and satisfied the purchasers of their domains, it offended the great mass of Frenchmen.

Method of paying the indemnity.

The manner in which the transaction was to be carried into effect was as follows: the sum involved was estimated at about a billion francs; the financial condition of the state did not permit the outright payment of so immense a capital; it was decided, therefore, to pay not the capital but the interest each year. This, it was estimated, would increase the annual expenditures of the state by about thirty millions.[1] This sum was procured by the conversion of the existing debt of France from a five per cent. to a three per cent. basis, thus saving about 28,000,000 francs in interest charges. In this way the indemnification of the émigrés would be effected without an increase in taxes. But this new act offended the nation's bondholders, who saw their income arbitrarily reduced by

[1] As a matter of fact, interest was paid not on a billion but on about 625,000,000 francs.

two-fifths. Thus the monarchy made enemies of a powerful class of capitalists, particularly the bankers of Paris. Money was taken from Peter to pay Paul. The strength of this class, which felt itself outrageously defrauded, was to be shown in 1830 to the great discomfiture of the Bourbon monarchy.

The law against sacrilege.

Another law that cast discredit upon this reign, and helped undermine it with the great mass of Frenchmen, was the law against sacrilege. By this act burglaries committed in ecclesiastical buildings and the profanation of holy vessels were, under certain conditions, made punishable with death. This barbaric law was, as a matter of fact, never enforced, but it bore striking witness to the temper of the party in power, and has ever since been a mark of shame upon the Bourbon monarchy. It helped to weaken the hold of the Bourbons upon France. It created a feeling of intense bitterness among the middle and lower classes of society, which were still largely dominated by the rationalism of the eighteenth century. They began to fear the clerical reaction more even than the political and social. The renewed missionary zeal of the church, the denunciation by Catholic bishops of civil marriage as concubinage, the open and great activity of the Jesuits, a society that had been declared illegal in France, all indicated the growing influence of the clergy in the state, an impression not decreased when, in 1826, the Papal Jubilee was celebrated with great elaborateness, and Frenchmen saw the King himself, clad in the violet robe of a prelate and accompanied by the court, walking in a religious procession through the streets of Paris. The university was under the control of the local bishop, who kept watch over professors whose opinions were denounced as dangerous, and who suspended many of their courses, as, for instance, those of Cousin and Guizot. Was it the purpose of the dominant party to restore both the nobility and the church to the proud position they had occupied before the Revolution?

Clerical reaction.

Criticism of the evident policy of the Government was becoming general and ominous. But the ministry proceeded with its plans with unusual fatuousness. It now attacked what was regarded as one of the most precious acquisitions of the Revolution, the right to an equal division of an inheritance among all the heirs. The ministry brought forward a proposal, quite modest in its scope, to re-establish the principle of primogeniture. The Civil Code provided that in case the deceased died without leaving a will, his real estate should be apportioned equally among his heirs; and this equal division was to be made of most of his property in land, even if he did leave a will. He was given liberty freely to dispose by will of only a portion larger or smaller, according to the number of children.

Attempt to re-establish the principle of primogeniture.

The proposal now made was that this disposable part, which a man might will to his eldest son if he chose, should go to him likewise, if there were no will, as a legal advantage over the other children. This was to be the law only for those who paid three hundred francs in direct taxes. As a matter of fact this law would affect probably not more than eighty thousand families out of six million. Furthermore, the father was in no way forced to constitute this preference for his eldest son, since he was left full liberty of testamentary disposition. Yet the mere suggestion threw the country into commotion. The prevailing thought was expressed by the Duke of Broglie, who said: "This is no law. It is a manifesto against existing society. It is a forerunner of twenty other laws which, if your wisdom does not prevent it, will break in upon us and will leave no rest to the society of France, which has been the growth of the last forty years." The proposition was defeated in the Chamber of Peers. For several nights the streets of Paris were illuminated in gratitude for this escape from feudalism.

These measures and failures, which were costing the ministry much popularity, were crowned by an attempt to render

Attempt to destroy the freedom of the press.

the press law more stringent. Charles X had long since regretted his act in abolishing the censorship. A bill was now proposed which wound an amazing mesh around the printing presses of France. So sweeping was it in character, giving the Government a practically unlimited control of all publications, both periodical, like the daily papers, and non-periodical, that it aroused immediately a remarkable opposition. It was denounced as barbaric by Châteaubriand, the foremost man of letters in France. "Printing," said Casimir-Périer, "is suppressed in France to the advantage of Belgium." Those engaged in this business, as well as the prominent writers and members of the French Academy, protested with vigor. The bill passed the Chamber of Deputies, but in the Chamber of Peers an opposition so intense developed that the ministry deemed it wise to withdraw the measure before it came to a vote. Paris was illuminated in honor of this escape. The provinces imitated the capital. These outbursts of joy were occasioned not only by the withdrawal of the press law. The people were already celebrating the fall of the hated Villèle ministry, which was felt to be imminent.

Disbandment of the National Guard.

The mistakes of this ministry, however, were not yet over. A few days after the withdrawal of this press bill the National Guard was reviewed by the King. The King was personally received with much warmth, but cries of "Long live the Charter," "Down with the Ministers, down with the Jesuits," were heard from the troops. Villèle at once demanded that these troops be disbanded. The King consented and it was done. This was a mistake for two reasons: because it offended the bourgeoisie of Paris, thus far opposed to the ministry but loyal to the King, and because the men were permitted to retain their arms, of which three years later they were to make effective use.

The ministry, conscious of rapidly waning power, did not propose to yield, but attempted to crush the opposition. It had been unable to get the press bill through Parliament.

The chief resistance the ministry had encountered had come from the Chamber of Peers, which had favored a moderate policy. Villèle thought to overcome this by packing that chamber with men who would support the ministry through thick and thin. Consequently seventy-six new peers were created, enough, it was thought, to enable the ministry to control that body thenceforth. But it was also clear that the opposition was growing in the Chamber of Deputies too. Although the ministry was able to get its measures through that chamber, its majority was gradually becoming smaller. Villèle therefore decided to dissolve the Chamber, although it had yet four years to run. He expected by manipulation of the election to get an assembly in its place overwhelmingly in favor of the ministry. Thus, with the press shackled, and the Chamber of Peers and Chamber of Deputies controlled, the ministry could retrieve the rebuffs it had recently experienced and carry out its policy in all its vigor.

Attempt to stamp out the opposition in Parliament.

Never did a minister make a greater mistake. The ministry was overwhelmingly defeated in the elections. Its supporters numbered only 170; the combined opposing elements counted 250. Villèle retired from office.

The Martignac ministry.

The Martignac ministry now came in in January 1828. The difficulties in its way were numerous. It had neither the favor of the King, nor the hearty support of the Chambers. Charles X told the new ministers, "Villèle's policy was mine, and I hope you will endeavor to carry it out as best you can." Martignac, however, made no such attempt, but strove rather to carry out a liberal policy, somewhat like that of the years 1816-20. The professors, Guizot, Villemain, whose courses Villèle had stopped, were reinstated. A somewhat more liberal press law was carried, abolishing censorship and the offense of "tendency." An educational law was enacted directed against the Jesuits and intended to please the more liberal religious element. But Martignac's course suited neither the Right nor the Left, and he shortly resigned. This pleased Charles X, who re-

sented the liberalism of the ministry. Charles believed that he had the right to choose the ministers to suit himself, whether they pleased the Chamber or not. "I would rather saw wood," he said, "than be a king of the English type."

The Polignac ministry.

With the fall of the Martignac ministry in 1829 fell also the last attempt made under the rule of the Bourbon Legitimists to fuse old and new France, to reconcile monarchy and constitutional freedom. The announcement of the new ministers was received with great popular indignation. The chief minister was Polignac, son of the Countess of Polignac, the friend of Marie Antoinette. Polignac had been one of the leaders of the émigrés at the outbreak of the Revolution, had joined in the Cadoudal conspiracy against Napoleon, had been sentenced to death, but had escaped with simply imprisonment, owing to the intervention of Josephine. In 1815 he had protested against the Charter, and had long refused to take the oath to support it. He had for years been very closely identified with Charles X, and had favored the most extreme laws proposed by him. Other ministers were Bourmont in the War Office, a man who was commonly supposed to have been a traitor to Napoleon, consequently to France, in 1815, and Labourdonnaye, Minister of the Interior, connected in the popular mind with the White Terror of 1815. Even Metternich, who could ordinarily view a policy of reaction with fortitude, considered the advent of such a ministry a matter of considerable gravity. "The change in the ministry is of the first importance," he wrote. "All the new ministers are pure royalists. Everything about the episode means counter-revolution." The feeling, that the appointment of this ministry was virtually a declaration of war to the bitter end against the modern society of France, was widespread, and was shared by all parties. Journals whose loyalty to the Bourbon monarchy was unimpeachable attacked the new ministry at once and in the most vigorous fashion.

Liberals of every shade began to organize to meet the

dangers which they felt were coming. Societies were formed. Old societies, like the Carbonari, renewed their activity. Men began to say that the House of Bourbon and a constitution were two incompatible terms. A faction was organized to prepare the way to the throne of the Duke of Orleans. Men began to study those chapters of English history which told how one prince could be put aside for another more to the liking of the nation. The groups opposed to the new ministry differed widely from each other in belief and purpose, Orleanists, Bonapartists, Republicans; but they were temporarily united in a common opposition. Indignation at the appointment of such a ministry was both widespread and deep, and became all the more vehement when Polignac declared his object to be "to reorganize society, to restore to the clergy its former preponderance in the state, to create a powerful aristocracy and to surround it with privileges."

Widespread opposition to the ministry.

For the time being, however, the ministry remained inactive, apparently amazed and checked by the remarkable ebullition of hostile feeling its appointment had called forth with the meeting of the Chambers. Early in March 1830 began a conflict which, short and sharp, ended in the overthrow and exile of Charles X. The King opened the session with a speech which clearly revealed his irritation at the Opposition, and his emphatic intention to support the ministry. The Chamber of Deputies, not at all intimidated, replied by an Address to the King, passed by a vote of 221 to 181, which was virtually a demand for the dismissal of the unpopular ministry, that thus "constitutional harmony" might be restored. The King replied by declaring that "his decisions were unchangeable," and by dissolving the Chamber, hoping by means of new elections to secure one subservient to his will. But the people thought otherwise. The elections resulted in a crushing defeat for the King and his ministry. Of the 221 who had voted for the Address, 202 were returned; of the 181 who had voted against it only

Conflict between Charles X and the Chamber of Deputies.

99 were returned. The total Opposition was increased from 221 to 270. The ministry could count on less than 150 votes in the new Chamber. The voters had spoken decisively.

This Liberal majority was not opposed to the monarchy. Had the King been willing to make some concessions, had he dismissed the ministry, the majority of the Opposition would have been satisfied. Charles X was urged to take this course by the most absolute of rulers, the Emperor Alexander, and by the most absolute of ministers, Metternich. Polignac was willing to go. But Charles had so conspicuously identified himself with his minister that yielding on that point seemed to him like abdicating. His own brother, Louis XVI, had come to a tragic end, he said, because he had made concessions. The ministry remained.

The ordinances of July.

Charles was unconquerably stubborn. Other methods of gaining his ends having failed, he now determined upon coercion. He resolved to issue a series of ordinances to meet the demands of the situation. The ordinances consequently appeared in the *Moniteur*, the official organ, July 26, 1830. They were four in number. The first suspended the liberty of the press. For the publication of any periodical a preliminary authorization of the Government was thenceforth to be required. This authorization must be renewed every three months and might be revoked at any moment. Thus the editors of France could not lawfully publish another issue without obtaining the permission of the Government. This, it was supposed, would effectually silence the opposition press. The second ordinance dissolved the Chamber of Deputies, just elected and overwhelmingly against the ministry, before that Chamber had ever met. This was to sport with the voters' rights to choose the deputies whom they desired. The reason assigned for this step was that during the late elections methods had been used "to deceive and mislead the electors." To prevent the recurrence of such manœuvers a third ordinance was issued gravely altering the electoral system. The number of deputies was reduced again to 258,

one-fifth renewable each year. The property qualification for the suffrage was so manipulated as practically to exclude the rich bourgeoisie, merchants, and manufacturers, liberals and partisans of the new régime born of the Revolution, and to lodge political power almost entirely in the hands of the class of great landed proprietors, chiefly members of the nobility of the old régime. The electorate was hereby reduced by about three-fourths. Instead of about 100,000 voters there were now to be about 25,000. The fourth ordinance ordered new elections and fixed the date for the meeting of the new Chamber of Deputies that would emerge from those elections.

Charles X's interpretation of the Charter.

The King had persuaded himself that in issuing these ordinances he was acting not against the Charter but in conformity with it. He based his right upon an interpretation of Article 14, which gave him the power to make "the necessary regulations and ordinances for the execution of the laws and the safety of the state." He held that the king alone had the right to interpret the Charter, as the king alone had granted it. His interpretation was monstrous and his application of it pure absolutism, since, if the ordinances were legal, the most carefully safeguarded clauses of the Charter could be made null and void by the monarch's act. Needless to say, the Charter did not give the king the right to alter or abolish the fundamental provisions of the Charter. If so the French people would enjoy their liberties simply at the humor of the monarch. Not to have opposed these ordinances would have been to acquiesce quietly in the transformation of the French government into the absolute monarchy of the time of Louis XIV. If the French cared for the liberties they enjoyed, they could not permit this action of the King to stand. They must repel the assault upon their political system to whatever extent might be necessary, for the first and third ordinances were plainly violations of the Charter.

Yet Charles X and his minister, Polignac, were confident

The King's mistaken judgment.

that there would be no trouble. The ordinances affected, they said, only a few people—newspaper men and those who had the right to vote—an exceedingly small minority. No right that the masses of the people enjoyed was infringed. The people, therefore, would have no motive or desire to rise to aid simply the privileged few. It was the belief of the ministry that the mass of the nation was indifferent to the electoral law and was satisfied with material prosperity. The Government, entertaining this view of the situation, took no serious precautions against trouble. The Minister of Police assured his colleagues that Paris would not stir. Charles X, having signed the fateful decrees, and feeling secure, went off to hunt at Rambouillet. On his return that evening everything was quiet and the Duchess of Berry congratulated him that at last he was king.

The opposition of the liberal editors of Paris.

The constitutional party, in truth, was poorly organized for resistance and moved slowly. The ordinances were aimed at the newspapers and the Chamber. The Chamber had not yet met. Its members were scattered over France, although some were in Paris. The first step in resistance was taken by the liberal editors of Paris. Under the leadership of Thiers they published a protest. "The reign of law has been interrupted; that of force has begun. The Government has violated the law; we are absolved from obedience. We shall attempt to publish our papers without asking for the authorization which is imposed upon us. The Government has this day lost the character of legality which gives it the right to exact obedience. We shall resist it in that which concerns ourselves. It is for France to decide how far her own resistance shall extend." On the following day the liberal members of the Chamber of Deputies drew up a formal protest against the ordinances, but outlined no course of action. The Revolution of 1830, however, was not to be accomplished by the journalists or the deputies.

As the significance of the ordinances came to be more

clearly seen, popular anger began to manifest itself. Crowds assembled in the streets shouting "Down with the Ministry!"; "Long live the Charter!" Fuel was added to the rising flame by the appointment of Marmont, odious as a traitor to France in 1814, to the command of the troops in Paris. The workmen of the printing establishments, thrown out of employment, began agitating, and other workmen joined them.

The July Revolution.

On Wednesday, July 28, civil war broke out. The insurgents were mainly old soldiers, Carbonari, and a group of republicans and workmen—men who hated the Bourbons, who followed the tricolor flag as the true national emblem, rather than the white flag of the royal house. This war lasted three days. It was the July Revolution—the Glorious Three Days. It was a street war and was limited to Paris. The insurgents were not very numerous, probably not more than ten thousand. But the Government had itself probably not more than fourteen thousand troops in Paris. The insurrection was not difficult to organize. The streets of Paris were narrow and crooked. Through such tortuous lanes it was impossible for the Government to send artillery, a weapon which it alone possessed. The streets were paved with large stones. These could be torn up and piled in such a way as to make fortresses for the insurgents. In the night of the 27th-28th the streets were cut up by hundreds of barricades made in this manner of paving stones, of overturned wagons, of barrels and boxes, of furniture, of trees and objects of every description. Against such obstacles the soldiers could make but little progress. If they overthrew a barricade and passed on, it would immediately be built up again behind them more threatening than before because cutting their line of reinforcements and of possible retreat. Moreover, the soldiers had only the flint-lock gun, a weapon no better than that in the hands of insurgents. Again, the officers had no knowledge of street fighting, whereas the insurgents had an intimate knowledge of the city, of

The character of the fighting.

its streets and lanes. Moreover, the soldiers were reluctant to fight against the people. The fighting continued two days amid the fierce heat of July. About six hundred lives were lost. Finally Charles, seeing his troops worsted and gradually driven back out of the city, determined to withdraw the ordinances. His messengers, who were bringing this news to the insurgents, were greeted with cries of "Too late, too late!" The insurgents were no longer content with the withdrawal of the odious measures that had precipitated the contest. They would have nothing more to do with Charles X. But the determination of the government to succeed his was a delicate matter. Those who had done the actual fighting undoubtedly wanted the republic. But the journalists and deputies and the majority of the Parisians were opposed to such a solution. They now took the aggressive and skilfully brought forward the candidacy of Louis Philippe, Duke of Orleans, representing a younger branch of the royal family, a man who had always sympathized with liberal opinions. On July 30 appeared a manifesto written by Thiers in the interest of this candidacy, running as follows: "Charles X may no longer return to Paris: he has caused the blood of the people to flow. The Republic would expose us to frightful divisions; it would embroil us with Europe. The Duke of Orleans is a prince devoted to the cause of the Revolution. . . . The Duke of Orleans is a citizen king. The Duke of Orleans has borne the tricolors in the heat of battle. The Duke of Orleans alone can again bear them; we wish no others. The Duke of Orleans makes no announcement. He awaits our will. Let us proclaim that will and he will accept the Charter, as we have always understood it and desired it. From the French people will he hold his crown."

The ordinances withdrawn.

The candidacy of Louis Philippe.

On the following day the deputies who were in Paris met and invited the Duke of Orleans "to exercise the functions of Lieutenant-General of the Kingdom." In a proclamation announcing this fact to the people it was stated: "He will

respect our rights, for he will hold his from us." The Duke of Orleans accepted the position until the opening of the Chambers which should determine upon the future form of government for France. He added, "The Charter shall henceforth be a reality." But the transition from the old to the new was not yet completed. The people, who, during these three hot July days, had done the actual fighting, desired a republic. They had their quarters at the Hôtel de Ville and must be reckoned with. The final decision between monarchy and republic lay in the hands of Lafayette, the real leader of the Republicans. It was of the highest importance to know his attitude.

On July 31 Louis Philippe rode to the Hôtel de Ville dressed in the uniform of a general and wearing the tricolor cockade. He appeared on the balcony. Lafayette appeared with him and embraced him. The effect of the little pantomime was instantaneous. The crowd shouted for Louis Philippe. This popular applause ended the brief hope of the Republicans. The crowd virtually gave another sovereign to France.

Abdication of Charles X.

Charles X now accepted the revolution. He abdicated, as did his eldest son, the Duke of Angoulême, in favor of the posthumous son of the late Duke of Berry, the Duke of Bordeaux, later well known in the history of France as the Count of Chambord and as Henry V, the title he would have worn had he ever become king. The leaders of the movement had, however, other ideas concerning the future government of France. They wished to be entirely rid of this legitimate royal line. Their first step was directed against Charles X and his immediate family. Desiring no repetition of the experience of the former revolutionists of having a king as prisoner they sent troops against him to frighten him out of the country. The method succeeded. Slowly the King and his family withdrew toward the coast, whence they embarked for England (August 14). For two years Charles X lived in Great Britain, keeping a

melancholy court in Holyrood Palace, Edinburgh, of somber memory in the life of Mary, Queen of Scots. Removing later to Austria, he died in 1836.

Louis Philippe King.

The Chamber of Deputies, whose dissolution by Charles X before it had ever come together, had been one of the causes of this revolution, organized itself August 3 and undertook a revision of the Charter. It then called Louis Philippe to the throne, ignoring the claims of the legitimate prince, the nine-year-old Duke of Bordeaux. The revolution was now considered over. It had had no such scope as had that of 1789. It grew out of no deep-seated abuses, out of no crying national distress. France was growing every day richer and more prosperous. It was an unexpected, impromptu affair. Not dreamed of July 25th, it was over a week later. One king had been overthrown, another created, and the Charter slightly modified. Parliamentary government had been preserved; a return to autocracy prevented.

The end of the Restoration.

The essential weakness of the monarchy of the Restoration was shown by the ease with which it was terminated. It always labored under the odium of its origin, having been brought back, as the phrase went, "in the baggage of the Allies," the enemies and vanquishers of France. The very presence of Louis XVIII and Charles X in France was a reminder of the humiliation of that country, was a trophy of her enemies' victories. Moreover, it was an inevitable fatality of this monarchy that its natural representatives and counselors had been long in exile, did not understand the complete intellectual transformation of their countrymen, had themselves always lived in a world of ideas alien to modern France, viewed the country they had to rule through a distorting though inevitable medium of preconceptions, prejudices, and convictions. The Bourbon monarchy accomplished much that was salutary. It restored the sadly disordered finances of the nation. Its policy in foreign affairs, in Greece, in Algeria, even in Spain, gave general satisfaction. But its ideal in government was the

old, aristocratic régime and it was impelled by its very nature to seek to approach that ideal. When it approached too near it suddenly found itself toppled over.

This ends the Restoration and the reign of Louis Philippe now begins. Those who brought about the final overthrow of the elder Bourbons received no adequate reward. They had the tricolor flag once more, but the rich bourgeoisie had the government. The Republicans yielded, but without renouncing their principles or their hopes. Cavaignac, one of their leaders, when thanked for the abnegation of his party, replied, "You are wrong in thanking us; we have yielded because we are not yet strong enough. Later it will be different." The revolution, in fact, gave great impetus to the doctrine of the sovereignty of the people.

CHAPTER V

REVOLUTIONS BEYOND FRANCE

Widespread influence of the July Revolution.

The influence of the Revolution of 1830 was felt all over Europe—in Poland, Germany, Italy, Switzerland, England, and the Netherlands. It was the signal and encouragement for wide-spread popular movements which for a short time seemed to threaten the whole structure erected in 1815 at Vienna. It created an immediate problem for the rulers of Europe. They had bound themselves in 1815 to guard against the outbreak of "revolution," to watch over and assure the "general tranquillity" of Europe. They had adopted and applied since then, as we have seen, the doctrine of intervention in the affairs of countries infected by revolutionary fever, as the great preservative of public order. Would this self-constituted international police acquiesce in the overthrow of the legitimate king of France by the mob of Paris? Now that revolution had again broken out in that restless country, would they "intervene" as they had done in Spain and Italy? At first they were disposed to do so. Metternich's immediate impulse was to organize a coalition against this "king of the barricades." But when the time came this was seen to be impracticable, for Russia was occupied with a revolution in Poland,

Powerlessness of the Holy Alliance.

Austria with revolutions in Italy, Prussia with similar movements in Germany, and England was engrossed in the most absorbing discussion of domestic problems she had faced in many decades. Moreover, England approved the revolution. All the powers, therefore, recognized Louis Philippe, though with varying indications of annoyance. In one particular, consequently, the settlement of 1815 was undone forever. The elder branch of the House of Bourbon,

put upon the throne of France by the Allies of 1815, was now pushed from it, and the revolution, hated of the other powers, had done it.

THE RISE OF THE KINGDOM OF BELGIUM

The Congress of Vienna and the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

Another part of the diplomatic structure of 1815 was now overthrown. The Congress of Vienna had created an essentially artificial state to the north of France, the Kingdom of the Netherlands. It had done this explicitly for the purpose of having a barrier against France. The Belgian provinces, hitherto Austrian, were in 1815 annexed to Holland to strengthen that state in order that it might be in a position to resist attack until the other powers should come to its rescue. The Congress had also declared and guaranteed the neutrality of the new state as an additional protection against an aggressive France.

A union of two fundamentally dissimilar peoples.

But it was easier to declare these two peoples formally united under one ruler than to make them in any real sense a single country. Though it might seem by a glance at the map that the peoples of this little corner of Europe must be essentially homogeneous, such was not at all the case. There were many more points of difference than of similarity between them. Their historic evolution had not been at all the same. Except under the overpowering rule of Napoleon they had not been under the same government since 1579. Holland had been a republic. The Belgian provinces had remained subject to Spain at the time that Holland had acquired her independence and had later passed under Austrian rule. They were also divided by language. The Dutch spoke a Teutonic tongue, the Belgians either Flemish, a Teutonic speech, yet differing from the Dutch, or Walloon, allied to the French. They were divided by religion. The Dutch were Protestants and Calvinists; the Belgians devoted Catholics. They differed in their economic life and principles. The Dutch were an agricultural and commercial people and were inclined to free trade; the Belgians

a manufacturing people and inclined toward protection. There was one form of union, however, under which such dissimilar peoples might have lived harmoniously together—that of a personal union. Each might have had the same monarch but have kept its own institutions and followed its own line of development. But at Vienna no thought was given to such an arrangement. It was decided that the union should be "close and complete."

The spirit of nationality awakened among the Belgians.

This was the first disappointment for the Belgians. They had hoped that henceforth they would have a large measure of independence. They had never yet constituted a nation. For centuries they had been subject to the Spaniards and the Austrians. But the French Revolution had powerfully aroused the longing for a national existence. This desire for liberty and independence, thwarted in 1815, operated with growing force throughout the period of their connection with Holland. The Belgians saw themselves simply added to and subjected to another people inferior in numbers to themselves.

Difficulties in the drafting of the Constitution.

Friction began at once. The king, William I, had promised a constitution to his united kingdom and appointed a commission to draw it up. The commission consisted of an equal number of Dutch and Belgian members. There were discussions as to the capital. The Dutch desired Amsterdam; the Belgians, Brussels. No decision was possible, and it was decided consequently to make no mention of the subject in the Constitution. It was agreed that there should be a legislature consisting of two chambers, an Upper Chamber appointed by the king, a Lower elected by the provincial estates. The latter was to be composed of 55 Dutch and 55 Belgian members. The Belgians objected to this equality, saying that they were a population of over three million, while Holland had less than two million. Holland replied that it had been a sovereign and independent state for over two centuries and that it would not admit Belgian predominance; also that wealth and general state

of civilization must be taken into account; moreover, that if population were regarded as the sole basis of the state Holland had a right to count in her colonies. She insisted upon a representation at least equal to that of the newly incorporated territories. As neither would recognize the predominance of the other, equality of representation was the only possible outcome.

Equal rights were granted all forms of worship. This was denounced by the Belgian Catholics. The Constitution gave great power to the king. The legislative bodies could reject but not amend bills. The right of trial by jury was not guaranteed, a right the Belgians had enjoyed under the French rule. The Constitution was now submitted to assemblies of the two peoples for approval. The Dutch assembly accepted it but the Belgian rejected it. Nevertheless, by an arbitrary exercise of power the King declared it in force.

Friction between the Belgians and the Dutch.

A union so inharmoniously begun was never satisfactory to the Belgians. Friction was constant. The Belgians objected with justice that the officials in the state and army were almost all Dutch. They objected to the King's attempts to force the Dutch language into a position of undue privilege. They objected to the system of taxation, particularly to two odious taxes on bread and meat, now imposed. Religious differences inflamed passions still further. Though the fact remains that during this period and largely because of this union the material prosperity of the Belgians advanced greatly, still the union never became popular. The evident desire of the King to fuse his two peoples into one was a constant irritation. The system was more and more disliked by the Belgians as the years went by.

The influence of the July Revolution.

Thus, long before the revolution in France, there was a strong movement in Belgium in favor of larger liberty, of self-government. Few as yet, however, dreamed of a disruption of the kingdom. There was a lively sense of grievances too long endured. The July Revolution now came

as a spark in the midst of all this inflammable material. On August 25, 1830, rioting broke out in Brussels. It was not at first directed toward independence. The Belgians would have been satisfied if each country could have been given its own government under the same king. The King rejected this proposal to change a "real" into a "personal" union. His troops attempted to put down the insurrection. There were in September several days of fighting in Brussels as there had been in Paris, and of the same character. The royal troops were driven out, and on October 4 the Provisional Government that had arisen out of the turmoil declared Belgium independent and called a congress to determine the future form of government. The King now prepared to make concessions, but it was too late. The congress decided in favor of a monarchy as the form of government, adopted a liberal constitution, and at the suggestion of England and France elected as king Leopold of Coburg, who had just declined the new throne of Greece, but who accepted this.

The Belgians declare their independence.

The task of greatest difficulty was to get the new kingdom recognized by the Great Powers, which in 1815 had added Belgium to Holland. Would they consent to the undoing of their own work? The king, William I, was resolved not to give up Belgium and was preparing to reconquer it, which he probably could have done, as Belgium had no army. Everything, therefore, depended on the powers which had suppressed revolution in Spain and Italy ten years before. Would they do it again in the interest of the treaties of 1815? Now, however, they were divided, and in this division lay the salvation of the new state. The Tsar wished to intervene in order "to oppose an armed barrier to the progress of revolution." Prussia seemed similarly inclined, but Louis Philippe, knowing that his own throne would be overthrown by the Parisians if he supinely allowed these absolute monarchies to crush the new liberties of the Belgians, gave explicit warning that if they inter-

vened France also would intervene against them "in order to hold the balance even" until the whole question should be settled by the powers, in congress assembled.

Intervention of the Holy Allies prevented by events in Poland.

In November, 1830, an insurrection broke out in Poland, which effectually prevented Russia from acting in the Belgian matter, caused Prussia to fix her attention upon her eastern boundaries, and filled Austria with apprehension. Thus the Holy Allies, hitherto so redoubtable as the opponents of revolutionary movements everywhere, were in no position to stamp out such a movement in Belgium. This part of the work of the Congress of Vienna had consequently been undone. A new state had arisen in Europe as a result of revolution. Its revolutionary origin, however, was covered up by the action of the powers in now consenting to it. Conferences of the powers, held in London at the close of 1830 and in 1831, accepted the separation of Belgium from Holland, guaranteed the neutrality of the new kingdom, and sanctioned the choice by the Belgians of Leopold as their ruler. The powers had the satisfaction of knowing that though the territorial arrangements of Vienna were altered, France, the arch-enemy, had gained nothing. Moreover, the monarchical principle was saved, as Belgium had been prevented from becoming a republic; but the new monarchy was constitutional, a fact pleasing to England and France, but odious to the three eastern powers.

Recognition of the Kingdom of Belgium.

The success of the Belgian revolution had to a considerable extent been rendered possible by a revolution in Poland, which ended in disastrous failure. Neither Russia, nor Prussia, nor Austria would have acquiesced so easily in the dismemberment of the Kingdom of the Netherlands had they not feared that if they went to war with France concerning it, France would in turn aid the Poles, and the future of the Poles was of far greater immediate importance to them than the future of the Netherlanders. The French Revolution of 1830 was followed by the rise of the Kingdom

of Belgium; but it was also followed by the disappearance of the Kingdom of Poland.

REVOLUTION IN POLAND

The restoration of the Kingdom of Poland in 1815.

Poland had been down to the last quarter of the eighteenth century an independent state. During that quarter its independence had been destroyed and its territory seized by its three neighbors, Russia, Prussia, and Austria, in the famous partitions of 1772, 1793, and 1795. But the Polish people's passionate love of country was not destroyed and their hope that Revolutionary and Napoleonic France would restore their independence was intense. It was, however, destined to disappointment. But with the fall of Napoleon hope sprang up in another quarter. Alexander I, Tsar of Russia, was in 1815 filled with generous and romantic aspirations and was for a few years a patron of liberal ideas in various countries. Under the influence of these ideas he conceived the plan of restoring the old Kingdom of Poland. Poland should be a kingdom entirely separate from the Empire of Russia. He should be Emperor of Russia and King of Poland. The union of the two states would be simply personal.

Alexander had desired to restore Poland to the full extent of its possessions in the eighteenth century. To render this possible Prussia and Austria must relinquish the provinces they had acquired in the three partitions. This, as we have seen, was not accomplished at the Congress of Vienna. There were henceforth four Polands—Prussian Poland, Austrian Poland, Russian Poland, and a new small independent Poland, created by the Congress of Vienna, the Republic of Cracow. The new Polish kingdom, erected by Alexander I in 1815, was then simply a part of historic Poland, nor did it indeed include all of the Polish territories that Russia had acquired.

Of this new state Alexander was to be king. To it he granted toward the close of 1815 a Constitution. There was

to be a Diet meeting every two years. This was to consist of a Senate, nominated by the king, and of a Chamber of Nuncios, elected by the assemblies of the nobles and by the communes. The latter chamber was to be elected for six years, one-third renewable every two years. Roman Catholicism was recognized as the state religion; but a generous measure of toleration was given to other sects. Liberty of the press was guaranteed, subject to laws designed to prevent its abuse. The Polish language was made the official language. All positions in the government were to be filled by Poles, not by Russians. No people in central Europe possessed such liberal institutions as those with which the Poles were now invested. A prosperous career as a constitutional monarchy seemed about to begin. The Poles had never enjoyed so much civil freedom, and they were now receiving a considerable measure of home-rule.

Alexander I grants a constitution to Poland.

But this régime, well-meant and full of promise, encountered obstacles from the start. The Russians were opposed to the idea of a restored Poland, and particularly to a constitutional Poland, when they themselves had no constitution. Why should their old enemy be so greatly favored when they, the real supporters of the Tsar, were not? The hatred of Russians and Poles, a fact centuries old, continued undiminished. Moreover, what the dominant class of Poles desired, far more than liberal government, was independence. They could never forget the days of their prosperity. Unfortunately they had not the wisdom or self-control to use their present considerable liberties for the purpose of building up the social solidarity which Poland had always lacked by redressing the crying grievances of the serfs against the nobles, by making all Poles feel that they were a single people rather than two classes of oppressors and oppressed. They did not seek gradually to develop under the ægis of their constitution a true and vigorous nationality, which might some day be strong enough to win its independence, but they showed their dissatisfaction

Friction between the Poles and the Russians.

with the limited powers Alexander had granted and shortly became obstructive and censorious—conduct lacking in tact and judgment.

The Diet criticized certain acts of the Tsar's officials and the Tsar warned the Diet. Friction developed from time to time, and, moreover, as the years went by, Alexander's early liberalism faded away. His successor, Nicholas I, who came to the throne in 1825, was a thorough-going absolutist. The spirit of unrest was strong among the mass of the lesser Polish nobility, a class little accustomed to self-control and also strongly influenced by the democratic ideas of Western Europe. This party was now inflamed by the reports of the successful revolution in France; by the belief that the French would aid them if they strove to imitate their example. When, therefore, the Tsar summoned the Polish army to prepare for a campaign whose object was the suppression of the Belgian revolution, the determination of the Liberals was quickly made. They rose in insurrection on the 29th of November, 1830. The Russian Grand Duke Constantine was driven from Warsaw. The revolutionists first tried negotiation with the Tsar, hoping in this way to secure their demands for larger political liberty. The attempt failed, but consumed time which the revolutionists could have used to much better advantage in arousing and organizing the country. When the Tsar sent word that Poland had but two alternatives—unconditional submission or annihilation—then the more radical revolutionists seized control of the movement, declared that the House of Romanoff had ceased to rule in Poland, and prepared for a life and death struggle.

Influence of the July Revolution.

Russia's military resources, however, were so great that Poland could not hope alone to achieve her national independence. The Poles expected foreign intervention, but no intervention came. Enthusiasm for the Poles was widespread among the people in France, in England, and in Germany. But the Governments, none of which was controlled by public

The Polish expectation of foreign aid disappointed.

opinion, refused to move. Louis Philippe, feeling his new throne quite insecure, did not wish to hazard it in the vicissitudes of a war. The revolution from which he had himself profited was a half-way affair. Revolutionary flames feed each other. If France should aid Poland the restless elements at home would be encouraged to go further and insist upon a thorough change in France which would endanger his position. England was not disposed to injure Russia, which might somewhere else wreak vengeance upon her. Prussia and Austria felt that an independent Poland would be a menace to them, as it would seek to win their Polish possessions. Moreover, patrons of reaction as they were, ought they to become, for no reason better than a popular sentiment, patrons of revolution?

The failure of the insurrection.

Thus Poland was left to fight alone with Russia and of the outcome there could be no doubt. The Poles fought with great bravery, but without good leadership, without careful organization, without a spirit of subordination to military authorities. The war went on from January 1831 until September of that year, when Warsaw fell before the Russians. The results of this ill-advised and ill-executed insurrection were deplorable in the extreme. Poland ceased to exist as a separate kingdom and became merely a province of the Russian Empire. Its Constitution was abolished and it was henceforth ruled with great severity and arbitrariness. The insurgents were savagely punished. Many were executed, many sent to Siberia. Thousands of Polish officers and soldiers escaped to the countries of western Europe and became a restless element in Paris, Berlin, and Vienna, always ready to fight for liberty. Even the Polish language seemed doomed, so repressive was the policy now followed by Russia. The Poles' sole satisfaction was a highly altruistic one, that by their revolt they had contributed greatly to the success of the revolutions in France and Belgium.

REVOLUTION IN ITALY

Italy after the revolutions of 1820.

Another country which felt the revolutionary wave of 1830 was Italy. The revolutions of 1820 and 1821 had occurred in northern and southern Italy. They had been easily crushed, largely by Austrian arms. During the next decade Austrian influence weighed ever more heavily upon the peninsula. Discontent with existing conditions was general. The various governments were despotic, reactionary, unenlightened. The Carbonari were constantly plotting new insurrections. In 1830 Prince Metternich declared Italy to be of all European lands the one which had the greatest tendency to revolution.

Revolutionary movements in 1831.

Metternich's diagnosis was destined to immediate vindication. Revolutions broke out in the states of central Italy in 1831. The Prince of Modena and the Duchess of Parma, Marie Louise, the former Empress, were forced to flee from their states. More serious was the rising in the Papal States against the government of the priests. In the Romagna, the northern part of the Papal States, Bologna, the center of the disturbance, declared the temporal power of the Papacy at an end. Nearly every town in the States except Rome joined the movement.

The revolutionists expected the inevitable hostility of Austria but hoped for the support of France as well as of the people in other Italian states. But France was a most uncertain reed. Louis Philippe desired peace above all things, not wishing to risk his newly acquired power in the chances of a war so far away and with so strong a state as Austria. His prime minister declared in a celebrated speech that "French blood belongs to France alone," a phrase odious to all Liberals as in it there was only egoism. Louis Philippe, too, was probably influenced by fear of the rise anew of Bonapartism out of an Italian war. The two sons of Louis Napoleon of Holland had offered their services to the Italian insurgents. Further, might not Austria,

The Italians receive no help from France.

irritated, permit Napoleon's son, the Duke of Reichstadt, now a virtual prisoner at Vienna, to return to France, in which case Louis Philippe's power would probably founder quickly? Feeling his position strong, Metternich decided to intervene and suppress the insurrection. Austrian troops were sent southward. The exiled rulers were easily restored. The Pope recovered his provinces. But a conference of the five great powers at this juncture demanded that he carry out extensive reforms, mainly in the direction of putting the government into the hands of laymen. The Austrian forces were then withdrawn. But the papal promises, not being kept, insurrection broke out again in 1832. Again the Papal Government was powerless to maintain itself. The Austrians once more crossed the frontier, at the request of the Pope. But this time France intervened, not in the interest of the Italians but, as she held, in the general interest of the European equilibrium which would be upset by the predominance of Austria in Italy. Asserting that she had as good a right to be in the Papal States as had Austria, she seized the fortress of Ancona, announcing that she proposed to stay there as long as Austrian troops remained. All this was a mere episode in the game of the balance of power. The two powers watched each other on the Pope's domains until 1838 when, the Austrians having withdrawn their troops, France gave up Ancona. Absolutism was restored in the Papal States and in the duchies.

Austrian intervention.

Thus another attempt of Italians to direct their own affairs had failed. The leaders were incapable, the odds too great. But there were certain results of importance. The absolute necessity of driving Austria out of the peninsula, if the peninsula was ever to have a career of its own, was proved once more; also the difficulty of driving her out. The hostility of the Papacy to any such project was again shown. The temporal power of the Pope had by some of his own subjects been declared at an end—a suggestive precedent. The ambition of the leaders, too, had been to make Rome

The results of the insurrections.

the capital of a new state of Italy. The revolutions of 1820 and 1821 had mainly been the work of military circles. The movements of 1831 and 1832 were joined by many merchants and laborers. Liberalism was appealing with increasing force to classes of the population hitherto passive or ignored. Liberalism was becoming more democratic. But for the time being reaction again held sway in Italy.

REVOLUTION IN GERMANY

Revolution in Germany.

Thus in 1830 revolution raged with varying vehemence all about Germany—in France, in Belgium, in Poland, and in Italy. The movement also affected Germany itself. In Brunswick, Saxony, Hesse-Cassel, and in two Saxon duchies revolutionary movements broke out with the result that several new constitutions were added to those already granted. The new ones were chiefly in North German, whereas the earlier ones had been mainly in South German states. But the two great states, Austria and Prussia, passed unscathed and set themselves to bring about a reaction, as soon as the more pressing dangers in Poland and Italy and France were over, and they themselves felt secure. Using certain popular demonstrations, essentially insignificant, with all the effect with which he had previously used the Wartburg festival, Metternich succeeded in carrying reaction further than he had been able to even in the Carlsbad Decrees of 1819. Those decrees were aimed chiefly at the universities and the press. New regulations were adopted in 1832 and 1834 by which he secured not only the renewal of these but the enactment of additional repressive measures.

New measures of repression.

In 1832 six new articles were adopted by the Diet of the Confederation, by which the suppression of liberalism was rendered more thorough than ever. By them every German sovereign was bound to refuse any petition of his local assembly that might impair his sovereignty; every assembly was forbidden to refuse its sovereign the taxes necessary to carry on the government or to use the taxing power to force

concessions from the prince, or to pass any laws prejudicial to the objects of the Confederation. A committee was to be appointed by the Diet to watch over the legislation of the different states, and to report all measures that threatened the rights of the Diet or of the individual sovereigns. The Federal Diet was made a kind of Supreme Court with power to interpret the fundamental laws of the Confederation and to decide what state laws were inconsistent with them, that is, were unconstitutional.

Metternich supreme in Germany.

The Diet also passed other repressive measures forbidding political societies, public meetings, and revolutionary badges, and promising aid to sovereigns in case of need. The decrees against the universities were enforced with renewed vigor. Thus not only universities, but chambers of deputies were now under the Metternich system. This was Metternich's crowning achievement in Germany. Again a persecution of professors, students, and journalists, surpassing previous ones, was instituted. Obstinate chambers of deputies were dissolved. Constitutional life in the few states where it existed was reduced to a minimum. The political history of Germany offers but little interest until the great mid-century uprising of 1848 shook this entire system of negation and repression to the ground.

CHAPTER VI

THE REIGN OF LOUIS PHILIPPE

The career of Louis Philippe, 1773-1850.

Louis Philippe, the new monarch of the French, was already in his fifty-seventh year. He was the son of the notorious Philippe Egalité, who had intrigued during the Revolution for the throne occupied by his cousin, Louis XVI, had, as a member of the Convention, voted for the latter's execution, and had himself later perished miserably on the scaffold. In 1789 Louis Philippe was only sixteen years of age, too young on the whole to play a political rôle, though he became a member of the Jacobin Club. Later, when the war broke out, he joined the army of his country and fought valiantly at Valmy and Jemappes. Becoming suspected of treason he fled from France in 1793 and entered upon a life of exile that was to last twenty-one years. He went to Switzerland, where he lived for a while, teaching geography and mathematics in a school in Reichenau. Leaving there when his incognito was discovered he traveled as far north as the North Cape, and as far west as the United States. He finally settled in England and lived on a pension granted by the British Government. Returning to France on the fall of Napoleon he was able to recover a large part of the family property, which, though confiscated during the Revolution, had not been actually sold. During the Restoration he lived in the famous Palais Royal in the very heart of Paris, cultivating relations that might some day prove useful, particularly appealing to the solid, rich bourgeoisie by a display of liberal sentiments and by a good-humored, unconventional mode of life. He walked the streets of Paris alone, talked, and even drank with workmen with engaging *bonhomie*, and sent his sons to the public schools to associate

His liberalism.

with the sons of the bourgeoisie—a delicate compliment fully appreciated by the latter. His palace was the meeting place for the liberal, artistic, intellectual society of Paris. Here certainly was a prince as nearly republican as a prince could be. The rights won by the Revolution would surely not be endangered by a man who so easily adapted himself to the new ideas that had come into the world with the great upheaval. Frenchmen, who dreaded the idea of a republic, discredited by the horrors of the Revolution, and who wished to do away with the old-style monarchy, revived by Charles X, might naturally be hopeful of combining the advantages of both and avoiding the evils of both by placing so amiable and enlightened a prince in power.

Thus the legend grew up, carefully fostered, that here was a prince who put patriotism above self-interest, who had fought and suffered for his country. It was not known then, or in 1830, that he had sought to fight against it during Napoleon's reign, nor was it known that under this exterior of ostentatious liberalism there lay a strong ambition for personal power, a nature essentially autocratic, thoroughly imbued with extreme monarchical principles. Louis Philippe had learned the arts of intrigue, of self-control, of silent, incessant exploitation of circumstances for his own advancement.

His legal title to the throne.

Such was the man who in 1830 became king, called upon to govern a country in a sea of troubles. His legal title to the throne was very weak, his actual position for many years most precarious. He had been invited to ascend the throne simply by the Chamber of Deputies—a chamber, moreover, which had been legally dissolved, which, furthermore, had never been authorized to choose a king, which was, therefore, giving away something it did not possess. Moreover, of that chamber of 430 members only 252 took part in the vote, 219 in favor of Louis Philippe, 33 opposed. The Chamber of Peers concurred, but its concurrence merely emphasized its nullity in the whole proceeding. The

choice of the new king was never submitted to the people for ratification, was never even submitted to the voters, who numbered about a hundred thousand. Louis Philippe was virtually the elect of 219 deputies who, in turn, had no legal standing. Though the people of France acquiesced in the new régime, they never formally sanctioned it. The new king, in order to show clearly the break with the past, assumed the name Louis Philippe, rather than Philip VII.

The Constitution revised.

The Chamber of Deputies, before calling Louis Philippe to the throne, drew up a Constitution to which he took oath. The Constitution was really a revision of the Charter of 1814 in those articles which had occasioned trouble during the last fifteen years, or which seemed inconsistent with the new monarchy. The fatal Article 14 was modified to read, "The king issues the ordinances necessary for the execution of the laws but never has power to suspend the laws or prevent their execution." Another change was that the right of initiating legislation should no longer belong simply to the king, but should be enjoyed by both chambers. The sessions of the Chamber of Peers were made public like those of the Chamber of Deputies.

Instead of the formula, "the Catholic religion is the religion of the state," a phrase that denoted a position of privilege, a new formula appeared to the effect that that religion was "professed by the majority of the French." It was explicitly provided that the censorship should never be re-established. Article 67 said, "France resumes its colors. For the future, no other cockade shall be worn than the tricolor cockade." Thus the flag of the Revolution, lustrous with victories on a hundred battlefields, replaced the white banner of the Bourbons. The preamble of the Charter of 1814 was suppressed because it sanctioned the theory of monarchy by divine right and because in it the king condescended to grant Frenchmen rights as an act of royal pleasure, which they considered belonged to them inherently. In most other respects the Charter of 1814 remained un-

altered. The age qualification was reduced for deputies to thirty years, for voters to twenty-five. It was, however, stated in the revision that the electoral system should be determined by ordinary law, thus providing for a supersession of the existing method.[1]

The franchise lowered.

A law was accordingly passed in 1831 establishing the system that was destined to remain in force until 1848. The law of the double vote was rescinded. The franchise, hitherto given only to those paying a direct property tax of 300 francs, was now extended to those paying one of 200 francs. The qualification was reduced to 100 francs in the case of certain professional classes, the "capacities," so-called, lawyers, physicians, judges, professors. Thus the electorate was doubled. But France was still far from democracy. At the beginning of the reign the voters numbered about two hundred thousand out of a population of about thirty millions. France was still governed by the propertied classes, by an aristocracy of wealth. Under the July Monarchy the bourgeoisie enjoyed a practical monopoly of power.

The character of the July Monarchy.

There was from the beginning a division of opinion as to the character of the new monarchy. Did Louis Philippe rule by divine right, or did he rule by the will of the people, expressed by their deputies? The very nature of the July Revolution showed that the former claim was untenable. That revolution had been made by the people of Paris against the monarch who ruled by divine right. Even with Charles X out of the way his legitimate successor was not Louis Philippe but the little Duke of Bordeaux. But did the accession of this prince to the throne prove on the other hand that all sovereignty was vested in the people? Many claimed that such was the case, that the people of France had virtually elected Louis Philippe king, that they might with equal propriety have elected any one else, that having elected him they could dismiss him. The opponents of those

[1] The constitution is given in full in Anderson, Constitutions and Documents, No. 105.

who held this view declared that this was to make the July Monarchy virtually a republic, and the fact remained that the republic had been deliberately rejected. This party argued that the new monarchy was peculiar—that the basis of the new system was a kind of contract between the king and the nation; that neither was absolutely sovereign, but that each possessed a part of the sovereignty; that thus each was indispensable to the other, each incomplete without the other; that France did not recognize without qualification the doctrine of the sovereignty of the people, or that of the sovereignty of the monarch; that the fusion of the two, inevitable, complete, was the basis of the state; that the true theory of the monarchy was that expressed in Louis Philippe's phrase that he was "king by the grace of God *and* the will of the nation."

Insecurity of the new régime.

Not only was the legal basis of the July Monarchy uncertain, but its practical hold on France was most precarious. It was forced to devote the first half of its life to the problem of getting solidly established. Improvised at the moment of revolution, cleverly set up in the midst of general confusion, it was singularly lacking in all the qualities that impose upon mankind, that command immediate respect, that indicate the possession of authority and power. There was nothing majestic about its origin. It had no roots. Devised by the rich bourgeoisie, it seemed the expression of purely business considerations. Whether it could captivate the sentiments of France, could throw about itself the glamour that usually hovers over a throne, remained to be seen. It certainly possessed no prestige at the moment of its inception. Metternich analyzed the situation with keenness. "Louis Philippe finds himself at his accession to the throne in an untenable position," wrote the Austrian Chancellor, "for the basis upon which his authority rests consists only of empty theories. His throne lacks the weight of the plébiscite which was behind all the forms of government from 1792 to 1801; lacks the tremendous support of his-

torical right, which was behind the Restoration; lacks the popular force of the republic, the military glory of the empire, the genius and the arm of Napoleon, the Bourbon support of a principle. Its durability will rest solely upon accidents."

A period of storm and stress.

Its durability, however, proved greater than had that of the Napoleonic Empire or of the Restoration. Yet it had first to pass through a long period of storm and stress. It had enemies without, who denied its very right to exist. And even the supporters of the new régime were divided into two parties who could not long co-operate, so different were their views of the policies that ought to be followed by the Government both at home and abroad. There was the so-called party of movement or progress, with Laffitte, a rich Parisian banker, and Lafayette, at its head. This party did not consider that the revolution was over as soon as Louis Philippe sat upon a throne. They wished at home to effect many reforms in a democratic sense, not with revolutionary haste but gradually; and abroad, they wished to aid those peoples which were revolting against misrule—as in Belgium, Poland, and Italy. Thus by making France more democratic and by supporting democratic movements elsewhere, France would resume in the world her position of leadership in liberalism, which she had held under the Revolution of 1789.

The progressive party.

The conservative party.

The other party was called the party of resistance, of conservatism. It believed that the Revolution of 1830 had terminated on August 9th when Louis Philippe accepted the revised constitution and became king. It held that the Revolution had simply substituted for a king who wished to overthrow the parliamentary system established in 1814 a king who wished to maintain that system; that the Revolution meant the preservation of existing institutions, did not at all mean the expansion of those institutions in a democratic direction; that it was a popular revolution designed to prevent a royal revolution. It believed that

France ought immediately to recover her normal condition, that the revolutionary passions which disturb men's minds and injure business ought to be quieted at once. Abroad, as well as at home, it would pursue a policy of peace. Casimir-Périer, Guizot, and the Duke of Broglie were leaders of this group.

Popular unrest.

Louis Philippe's preferences were decidedly for the latter party. Yet he could not at first break openly with the former. For some time, therefore, he called members of both to the ministry. Such a ministry could not from the very nature of the case have a clear, coherent policy. Revolutionary passions still ran riot in Paris. Crowds demanded the execution of the ministers of Charles X, who had advised the autocratic actions of that monarch. Mobs attacked Legitimists in the streets of Paris. These outbreaks resulted in business stagnation. The working classes suffered. It is said that 150,000 of them left Paris in search of employment. Public credit sank rapidly. The bonds fell. No one could foresee what would happen either at home or abroad. The bourgeoisie felt insecure and rallied to the party of resistance.

Finally March 13, 1831, Casimir-Périer and the party of resistance came into power. That party was destined to remain in power, with some variations, more or less marked, during the rest of the reign of Louis Philippe. Its policy truly expressed the essential character of the July Monarchy, which fell after eighteen years because it had not accomplished the democratic reforms demanded by the party of progress.

Casimir-Périer and the policy of the conservatives.

Casimir-Périer was a man of great wealth, of imperious temper, of positive opinions, of incisive speech. The principles according to which he intended to administer the government were boldly and clearly stated in an address delivered in the Chamber of Deputies shortly after the formation of his ministry. His declarations formed virtually the programme of the party of resistance. He announced

his intention to carry out without weakness and without exaggeration the principle of the July Revolution. Now that principle was not insurrection; it was resistance to executive aggression. "France was exasperated, she was defied; she defended herself, and her victory was the victory of law basely outraged. Respect for plighted faith, respect for law, that is the principle of the Revolution of July, the principle of the government founded by it. For that Revolution founded a government and did not inaugurate anarchy. It did not overthrow the form of society, it affected only the political system. It aimed at the establishment of a government that should be free but orderly. Thus violence must not be, either at home or abroad, the character of our government. At home every appeal to force, abroad every encouragement of popular insurrection, is a violation of its principle. Such is the thought, such the rule of our home and foreign policy. Order must be maintained, the laws must be executed, authority respected. Public security and tranquillity must be revived. The Revolution has not begun for France the reign of force. The blood of the French belongs to France alone. The first result of this Revolution has been to render monarchy more popular by reconciling it with liberty."

Foreign policy.

Casimir-Périer formulated for foreign affairs the principle of non-intervention, promising not to intervene in favor of peoples in insurrection, but asserting that foreign powers had likewise no right to intervene beyond their own frontiers. This principle was absolutely opposed to that on which the Holy Alliance had been acting. Later Casimir-Périer did intervene in Italy and in Belgium in the name of the principle of non-intervention.

This policy of rigorous restoration of order was begun at once. Casimir-Périer died in 1832 after a service of only fourteen months, but the policy he outlined with such clearness and firmness, and put into force, was continued in large measure by his successors.

Opposition parties.

The Government needed whatever strength it could get from a concentration of all its forces for the preservation of its existence, for the parties that desired the overthrow of the Orleanist Monarchy were active and daring. These parties, the Legitimists and the Republicans, it finally succeeded in silencing, though not until after much shedding of blood.

The Legitimists.

For the Legitimists, those who defended the rights of Charles X and his descendants, Louis Philippe was a usurper, a thief who had treacherously stolen the crown of the Duke of Bordeaux, the legitimate king. This party was numerically small, but it had in the Duchess of Berry a dauntless and resolute, if imprudent leader. A woman of unusual personal charm, attracting people to her and her plans despite their better judgment, she now, an exile in England, conceived the idea of winning a throne for her son, the Duke of Bordeaux. That the accomplishment of this would be the very climax of adventure did not sober her romantic, passionate nature. She believed that foreign monarchs would aid in asserting the principle of legitimacy, which lay at the basis of their own power. The magic of Napoleon's return from Elba was fresh in the mind of Europe. Might not a beautiful woman, representative of the House of Bourbon, succeed where the audacious soldier had succeeded? The Duchess won the reluctant consent of Charles X. She counted for success upon the favorable situation of the European powers, upon the supposed strength of the Bourbon party in France, upon the co-operation of the clergy and the nobility, and upon the support of the Vendée, considered the home of chivalric devotion to the white flag of the Bourbons. She felt so sure of success that she had already prepared a new constitution. She was warned in vain by prominent Legitimists of the total lack of effective preparations for so desperate an undertaking. Crossing the continent from England to Italy, she landed in France April 28, 1832, and, concealed in a hut, waited

The Duchess of Berry.

for the promised rising of Marseilles. Even the news that this had failed and that the leaders were prisoners did not daunt her. She had told the faithful to be ready for her in Vendée on the first of May. She must keep the promise. Eluding the spies who were upon her heels, after great hardship, constant danger, and numerous adventures, she succeeded in reaching her destination. But the Government knew of the plan and the few hundred defenders of the legitimate monarchy were put down after a brave resistance. The Duchess escaped, reached Nantes after great exertions, and eluded the police for several months. She was betrayed by a person whom she had employed on several errands, was arrested, and was imprisoned until it was thought she was dishonored and rendered politically impotent by the birth of a daughter and the avowal of a secret marriage.

At the very time this royalist insurrection was being put down in the west, a republican insurrection burst out in Paris. Lafayette had won the acquiescence of the Republicans in the erection of the July Monarchy, but only by assuring them that it would be the "best of republics." But this did not prove to be the case. By 1832 it seemed clear to them that they had been duped, and that the July Monarchy promised no growth in liberty for France. They then became its bitter enemies.

Republican insurrections.

An insurrection broke out in Paris in June 1832 on the occasion of the funeral of General Lamarque, a prominent Republican. It was not sanctioned by the prominent men of the republican party. The generals, known to be Republicans, remained inactive. The insurgents, therefore, were obscure, and their number was small, yet they fought with desperation for two days in the streets of the capital. They were defeated because they were unable to gain the co-operation of any considerable body of men. The workmen of Paris did not rise. The leaders refused to lead. Yet an insurrection so ill-timed and so ill-directed occasioned considerable loss to the Government. It was important as be-

ing the first frankly republican insurrection since 1815, and it was the strongest opposition the Government of July had thus far had to overcome. The Republicans were not discouraged by this failure, but went on preparing for the future. The Government favored a law aimed at breaking up the secret societies which were spreading republican principles, by restricting the right of association. Henceforth, any association, whatever might be its nature and whatever the number of its members, must submit its constitution and by-laws to the Government, and might not exist without its consent. Hardly had the new law been passed than new insurrections burst forth in several cities. Particularly important was that in Lyons in April 1834, which grew out of labor troubles but quickly took on a political character. For five days the riot raged in that city, finally, after great exertions, being put down by the Government. Insurrections also occurred in several other cities.

Vigorous measures of the Government.

The Government was successful in suppressing these republican upheavals. It made no attempt to conciliate the discontented. It did not study the labor problem, which was one of the causes of the prevalent unrest, but determined to crush this annoying faction once for all. Republicanism must be stamped out. To this end the press must be controlled. The revised Charter of 1830 had provided for freedom of the press, and had declared the censorship abolished forever; yet the July Monarchy from the very moment of its inception had vigorously prosecuted republican journals, instinctively recognizing in them its most dangerous enemy. From July 1830 to September 1834 it had instituted over five hundred trials of journalists alone, had imposed heavy fines and long terms of imprisonment upon editors. The *Tribune*, the most aggressive republican sheet, had been prosecuted 111 times and had been forced to pay 157,000 francs in fines. Such prosecutions were more frequent than ever after the futile insurrections of April 1834.

The prosecution of journalists.

In addition to press prosecutions the Government determined to prosecute some of those who had been arrested in the recent riots. It instituted a monster trial of 164 accused, not before the jury courts, distrustful of the results in that case, but before the Chamber of Peers. Over four thousand witnesses were called. The defendants refused to recognize the jurisdiction of the Peers or to defend themselves. The case dragged on for months, from March 1835 to January 1836, creating much bitterness of feeling. Finally the accused were condemned to various terms of imprisonment or to deportation. But the decision was not enforced. A general amnesty, proclaimed a little later on the occasion of the marriage of the King's eldest son, liberated them. By these vigorous methods, however, the republican party was effectually silenced for many years. Its impotence was increased still further by divisions among the members themselves.

Attempts upon the life of Louis Philippe.

Not only were attacks made upon the Government during these stormy years, but attempts upon the life of the King were frequent. These were ascribed to the Republicans and served to discredit them still further. They were not the acts of the party but of isolated individuals. From 1835 to 1846 six different attempts to assassinate the monarch were made and numerous other plots were discovered before they could be put into operation. The most horrible of these was that of Fieschi in 1835. An infernal machine composed of many gun-barrels was discharged by a Corsican, Fieschi, at the King as he was passing with his three sons and many members of the court and army through the streets of Paris, July 28, 1835. Eighteen persons were killed on the spot, many more were injured. The King and his sons escaped as by a miracle.

The September Laws, 1835.

The Government, encouraged by the widespread execration of this fiendish crime, determined to strike hard at all opponents. It secured the passage in September 1835 of new laws concerning the assize courts, the jury system,

and the press. The Minister of Justice was empowered to establish as many of these assize or special courts as might be necessary to judge summarily all those attacking the security of the state. The accused might be judged even though absent. In jury trials the decision might henceforth be given by a mere majority, seven, instead of the two-thirds vote, eight, previously required. The third and most important law concerned the press. It was designed to protect the king, the constitution, and the fundamental principles of society from attack. Heavy fines, as high as 50,000 francs, were imposed for various offenses—for a summons to insurrection, even if the insurrection should not occur; for attacks upon the King, even allusions to his person, or caricatures; for publication of jury lists; for the collection of subscriptions to aid newspapers to pay their fines. The law went even further and forbade Frenchmen under heavy fines the right to defend other forms of government than the existing one, to declare themselves adherents of any fallen royal house; to question the principle of private property. The censorship was re-established for drawings, caricatures, and plays. The preliminary deposit required of papers was raised to 100,000 francs.

The press law.

These September laws gave great offense to all liberal and moderate men. After five years of freedom of the press to return to so far-reaching a suppression of that freedom seemed unjustifiable. The most careful defense of the King and the constitution was certainly desirable, but did it require any such drastic measures at this time? Would not the very multiplicity of crimes tend to encourage crime?

These laws greatly weakened the July Monarchy. Men felt that individual liberty was only an empty word. The press law was aimed particularly at the Legitimists and the Republicans. The papers of the former party, well supplied with capital, survived the persecution to which they were now subjected. The republican organs, lacking

this resource, largely disappeared. The press in France was in as deplorable a condition as in the worst days of the Restoration.

The Bonapartists.

The Government might now feel secure against the attempts of the Legitimists and the Republicans. The only other party that was an inevitable opponent of the July Monarchy was the Bonapartist. But of this Louis Philippe entertained no fear. Indeed, with what proved to be singular fatuity, he distinctly promoted by his actions the growth of a sentiment that in the end was to prove very costly both to himself and to France. With the evident intention of showing that the July Monarchy, unlike that of the Restoration, was truly national, that it had no desire to eliminate all reminders of the Napoleonic era, but rather regarded them as among the priceless glories of France, he completed the Arc de Triomphe, begun by Napoleon, named streets and bridges after Napoleon's battles, and caused the Napoleonic history to be portrayed on the walls of the palace at Versailles, side by side with that of Louis XIV. Literature was already busy creating the Napoleonic legend, which, ignoring the evils and the frightful cost to France of the great Emperor's rule, was immortalizing his achievements and mourning his tragic end. It was singular policy, indeed, for a descendant of Capetian kings to foster the reviving interest in the career of the illustrious founder of a rival family. But that no danger lay that way seemed to be proved by two attempts on the part of the heir to the Napoleonic throne to overthrow the July Monarchy, which was showing itself so complaisant to the Napoleonic sentiment, attempts which resulted in ridiculous failures.

Louis Philippe and the Napoleonic legend.

Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, 1808-1873.

Napoleon I had died in 1821, and his son, the King of Rome, known after 1818 as the Duke of Reichstadt, had died in 1832. The headship of the family thus passed to Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, the son of Louis Napoleon, formerly King of Holland, and of Hortense Beauharnais, daughter of the Empress Josephine. Napoleon had indicated

that the succession should be in this line in case he should leave no direct descendant. Prince Louis, born in the Tuileries in 1808, had been educated in Germany, and had gone to Italy, where, in 1831, he had participated on the popular side in the revolutionary movements described above. He was now living in Switzerland, brooding over his fortune, taking seriously his rôle of pretender, publishing his political views. Suddenly he appeared before the garrison of the fortress of Strassburg in 1836, wearing the familiar Napoleonic coat and hoping to win the support of the soldiers by the very magic of his name. Thus having a lever he could perhaps topple Louis Philippe from his throne. He failed miserably, and was brought to Paris a prisoner. The Government, thinking it wise to treat this episode as a childish folly, did not prosecute him but allowed him to sail to the United States. But Louis returned next year to Switzerland. He removed to England upon the threat of Louis Philippe, taking part there in fashionable or semi-fashionable life, elaborating his political theories and planning for his political future. His undertaking had failed but he had at least announced himself to France as the heir of the Great Napoleon. He believed firmly in his star and felt that he would some day be called to finish the interrupted work of his uncle.

The second funeral of Napoleon I.

The Government of Louis Philippe proceeded to inject still further vitality into the growing Napoleonic legend. It secured the consent of the English Goverment to the removal of the remains of Napoleon from St. Helena to Paris, where they might repose according to the wish which the Emperor had himself expressed in his last testament, on the banks of the Seine, "in the midst of the French people whom I have loved so well," and in December 1840 they were deposited beneath the dome of the Invalides with elaborate funeral pomp and amidst evidences of extraordinary popular excitement. A minister of Louis Philippe said in the Chamber of Deputies, "He was Emperor and King, the legitimate

sovereign of this land; as such he might rest in St. Denis. But he is entitled to more than the usual burial place of kings." The question put by Lamartine was pertinent. What was the Government thinking of "to allow the French heart and imagination to be so fired?"

The Boulogne fiasco.

Meanwhile, Louis Bonaparte, pretender to the throne, had resolved to take advantage of this renewed interest in Napoleon. Declaring that the ashes of the Emperor ought to rest only in an Imperial France, he made another attempt to overturn the Government of Louis Philippe. On August 6, 1840, he landed with about sixty companions near Boulogne, hoping to win over the garrison of that town and then to enact another "return from Elba," an event whose fascination for adventurers was lively, but an achievement difficult to repeat. He brought with him proclamations declaring the House of Orleans dethroned. The failure of this attempt was more humiliating than that of Strassburg, four years earlier. The little group was scattered by the appearance of troops. They fled toward the beach, where most of them surrendered. But a few, among them the Prince, plunged into the water in order to get to a boat nearby, which capsized as they were attempting to scramble into it. They were seized by the authorities. But the Prince, brought before the Chamber of Peers for trial, had a chance to make a speech. "For the first time in my life," he said, "I am at last able to make my voice heard in France and to speak freely to Frenchmen. . . . The cruel and undeserved proscription which for twenty-five years has dragged my life from the steps of a throne to the prison which I have just left has not been able to impair the courage of my heart. . . . I represent before you a principle, a cause, a defeat. The principle is the sovereignty of the people: the cause is that of the Empire: the defeat is Waterloo." His eloquence, however, was unavailing. He was condemned to imprisonment for life in the fortress of Ham. He escaped, however, six years later disguised as

a mason. Two years after that he was the most important figure in France.

Ministerial instability.

The parliamentary history of France during the ten years from 1830 to 1840 was marked by instability. There were ten ministries within ten years. Yet there was a fairly continuous policy. Ministries might disappear and new ones come on the scene, but all after the fall of Laffitte, 1831, were composed of men of the party of resistance, such as Casimir-Périer, Broglie, Thiers, and Guizot. The chief work was to consolidate the July Monarchy, to put down its enemies, and to keep the peace with foreign countries. When, however, the members of this party had finally triumphed over their adversaries, they divided against each other. The personal rivalry of two men, Thiers and Guizot, was largely the cause of this. Each desired the leading place in the Government. Out of this rivalry arose two parties, one called the Left Center, with Thiers as leader, the other called the Right Center, under Guizot. The division, however, was not based simply upon the personal ambitions of the two men. Each had its theory of the constitution. Thiers held that the king reigns but does not govern; in other words, the king must always choose his ministers from the party that is in the majority in the Chamber and must then let them govern without intervening personally in affairs. Guizot, on the other hand, held that the king should have the greatest consideration for the opinions of the majority but that he was not bound strictly to follow that majority. "The throne," he said, "is not an empty chair."

Rivalry of Thiers and Guizot.

Louis Philippe intends to rule.

Louis Philippe had no desire to be simply an ornamental head of the state, as he was according to Thiers' view. He desired to be the real ruler, to govern as well as to reign. He insisted upon conducting foreign affairs himself, and he endeavored to exercise a controlling influence in other ways through his ministers. But for several years after his accession to the throne he was careful to guard himself from

all appearance of assuming personal power. But now that his enemies were overthrown and crushed, now that these street insurrections were stamped out, he began to reveal his real purpose more clearly, which was to be ruler in fact as well as in theory. Taking advantage of the party divisions just alluded to he forced Thiers, the chief minister and a man too independent to be a mere spokesman of the King, to resign in 1836, and called to the ministry Molé, a man who, as he correctly supposed, would, because of his political convictions, be very willing to be the representative of the King's personal views. Men began at once to talk of "personal government," of the interference of the monarch in the realm that properly, they held, belonged to parliament. References to Charles X became frequent. A vigorous opposition to this "court policy" and "court ministry" finally brought about its fall in 1839. Thereupon Soult became chief minister, but was looked upon as as much the representative of the King as Molé had been. His brief ministry was notable for a direct rebuff administered through him to the monarch. Louis Philippe asked for an appropriation for his son, the Duke of Nemours. The Chamber rejected the request by a vote of 226 to 220. The Soult ministry then retired and at last the King, appearing to renounce his personal ambition, called Thiers to the ministry.

Personal government.

The chief feature of the short Thiers ministry was its treatment of the Eastern Question, which in a new phase had been for several years before Europe again. The existence of the Turkish Empire was once more threatened, this time by a powerful vassal of the Sultan. After the Greek war of independence, in which the viceroy of Egypt, Mehemet Ali, had greatly aided the Sultan, the former was dissatisfied with his reward. He began to extend his possessions by arms. He conquered all of Syria (1832). He pushed forward into Asia Minor, defeating the Turkish generals sent against him. He prepared to go still further, to Constantinople. At once the European powers began to take sides.

Thiers and the Eastern Question.

Russia offered her aid and succeeded in making a treaty with the frightened Sultan, the treaty of Unkiar Skelessi, 1833, whereby, for certain obligations she was to assume, she acquired an almost complete control of the Turkish government. England, hostile as ever to Russian influence in Turkey and also wishing to maintain her own commercial prestige in the East, came to the aid of Turkey. Russia and England, therefore, declared their intention of maintaining the integrity of the Sultan's dominions, though their motives were contradictory. Prussia and Austria took the same side, asserting that the rights of legitimate monarchs must be maintained. On the other hand, France supported Mehemet Ali. The French had been attracted toward Egypt ever since Napoleon's expedition. The Egyptian army was organized and drilled by Frenchmen. France had just conquered Algiers. A close connection between Mehemet Ali and France would probably offer considerable commercial and political advantage in the Mediterranean. Thus France became the patron of Mehemet. But she stood alone. Her isolation was shown to all the world when the powers met in conference in London in 1840 and, ignoring her, because they knew that she was hostile, made a treaty with Turkey, pledging themselves to force Mehemet Ali to terms. The publication of this treaty aroused a warlike feeling in France, as it seemed to exclude her from the concert of powers, as in 1815. Thiers urged the adoption of warlike measures, but the King vigorously opposed such proposals, which would involve France and the July Monarchy in the greatest danger. Thiers resigned and Guizot now became chief minister. France adopted a policy of peace and the danger of a war passed. Thus the King rather than the ministry had determined the policy of the Government. Incidentally, Louis Philippe found himself relieved of the minister who believed that the king should reign but should not govern, and he gained in Guizot, who now became the leading minister and who remained in power until 1848,

Resignation of Thiers.

an instrument through which he was enabled to carry out with great skill his personal policy during the remainder of his reign.

Guizot, 1787-1874.

With the elevation of Guizot to the leading position in the Government, France attained ministerial stability. The administration of which he was the head remained in power from 1840 to 1848. Guizot was now fifty-three years of age. He had been a Liberal at the time of the Empire and the Restoration. Eminent as a professor, an historian, and an orator, he was a man of strong and rigid mind, holding certain political principles with the tenacity of a mathematician. In a world of change he remained immutable. He refused to recognize that France needed any alteration in her political institutions. He believed in the Charter of 1814 as revised in 1830. Any further reform was unnecessary and would be dangerous. To preserve order within and peace without, that the wealth of France might increase, was his programme. His policy was, as he said in his opening speech in the Chamber, the "maintenance of peace everywhere and always."

Guizot's political principles.

These were also the views of Louis Philippe. The King could in no sense use Guizot as a pliant tool. Guizot was a man of far too great independence of thought, of far too vigorous and original character, to be the tool of any man. But this harmony of opinions was so complete that the King could complacently watch his minister carry out the royal programme, and Louis Philippe was always far more concerned with the reality than with the appearance of power.

The Government scrupulously parliamentary.

Moreover, the Government was scrupulous in its adherence to parliamentary forms, in which Guizot was a strict believer. This ministry always had a majority in the Chamber of Deputies. That majority, indeed, increased at each election. There was no attempt to defy the Chamber and exalt the royal prerogative. The King could not be accused of aspiring to play a personal rôle as in the days of Molé,

for the ministry directed the Government and the ministry constantly had a majority of the Deputies to approve its actions. What France witnessed was a policy of stiff conservatism, or immobility, constantly supported by the Chamber.

How the Government obtained its majorities.

The attention of the country consequently became riveted on that majority. How was it obtained? It was clear that it did not represent public opinion, did not at all express the convictions of France as a whole. It became evident on examination that that majority, the never failing support of the ministry, was obtained by an elaborate system of corruption. Louis Philippe and Guizot took no account of public opinion. They fixed their attention solely upon what was called the *pays légal*, that is, upon the body which possessed political rights under the constitution, namely, the voters and the deputies whom the voters chose. Now the number of voters was about 200,000, the number of deputies 430. Bodies so small could be manipulated and the manipulation was the supreme task of Guizot, the very foundation of his system. It was accomplished without difficulty. France was a highly centralized state, with local government largely controlled by the central power. Consequently, the ministry had at its disposal an immense number of offices and it could do numberless favors to individuals and to communities. The electoral colleges, which chose the deputies, were small bodies frequently consisting of not more than two hundred members, many of whom were office-holders. The office-holders did as they were told by the Government, and other members were bribed in various ways by appeals to their self-interest. If they elected the candidate desired by the minister they might be rewarded by seeing a railway built in their district, for this was the period of railway building; or they might obtain tobacco licenses or university scholarships or petty offices for their friends. Many were the attractions held out to the self-interest of the voters, the *pays légal*. This was plainly

The manipulation of the voters.

corruption of the electorate, but it worked well in the opinion of the ministry. It insured the election to the Chamber of a large number of deputies pleasing to the ministry. Within the Chamber the same methods were used. About two hundred deputies, nearly half the assembly, were at the same time office-holders. The Government controlled them, as all promotions or increases of salary were dependent upon its favor. The ministry only needed to gain a few more votes to have a majority, and this was easily accomplished by a tactful distribution of its favors among those who had an eye to the main chance. There were plums enough for the purpose, offices to be bestowed, railroad franchises to be granted, lucrative contracts for government supplies to be awarded. "What is the Chamber?" said a deputy in 1841. "A great bazaar, where every one barters his conscience, or what passes for his conscience, in exchange for a place or an office."

The manipulation of the deputies.

Such a system was a mockery. The forms of the constitution were observed but its spirit was nullified. Self-interest was exalted above the interests of the nation. The ministry commanded a servile parliament. It is one of the ironies of history that Guizot, a man of most scrupulous honesty in private life, should have been the master mechanician of so corrupt and demoralizing a political machine.

The servility of Parliament.

Opposition to this system was, of course, inevitable, and is the main feature of the domestic politics of France from 1841 to 1848, when Louis Philippe and Guizot and the entire régime were violently overthrown. Reformers demanded that there be a change in the composition of the Chamber of Deputies and in the manner of electing it, parliamentary reform and electoral reform. Electoral reform should be effected by increasing the body of voters, by lowering the property qualification, and by adding certain classes which could safely be intrusted with the suffrage, even if they could not meet the property qualification. Thus with an increased body of voters corruption would be more

Demand for electoral and parliamentary reform.

difficult. The ministry absolutely refused to consider this proposition. According to Guizot there were voters enough; moreover, the number was increasing with the increase of wealth. He even rejected a proposition that would have added only fifteen thousand voters to the existing electorate.

Rigid opposition of the Guizot ministry.

It was demanded that the reform of the Chamber itself should be effected by forbidding deputies to hold office. Against this also the ministry set itself. Both plans, therefore, were rejected and the policy of immobility complacently continued. Year after year the two demands were brought forward in the Chamber; year after year they were voted down by the pliant majority. Reformers appeared to be hopelessly checkmated by the smooth operation of the machine they were denouncing. Well might Lamartine exclaim to Guizot, "According to you, the genius of the politician consists of only one thing—placing yourself in a position created by chance or by a revolution, and there remaining immobile, inert, implacable to all improvement. If in truth that were all the merit of a statesman directing a government, there would be no more need of statesmen: a post would do as well." This inertia ultimately disgusted some of the conservatives themselves. One of the members who had hitherto followed the ministry, summing up its work in 1847, said, "What have they done for the past seven years? nothing, nothing, nothing." "France is bored," said Lamartine.

Rise of radicalism.

Yet this July Monarchy with its negative policy of resistance in season and out of season, resistance to lawlessness in the streets, to attacks of Legitimists and Republicans, to demands for an active foreign policy favorable to liberty, to demands for constitutional reform at home, was living in a world fermenting with ideas, apparently oblivious of the fact. Not only did its policy alienate many former supporters by its rigid and peremptory refusal of all concessions, and augment and sharpen more and more the antagonism of the Republicans, but its complete indifference

to a new set of demands in the economic sphere, demands for social reform, was creating bitter enmities in another quarter and preparing a troublous future. There was growing up in France a party more radical than the republican, a party that looked forward not only to a change in the political form of the government but to a sweeping alteration in the form of society, in the relation of the great mass of the population who were wage-earners to the privileged few, the capitalists and employers. The July Monarchy was a government of the bourgeoisie, of the well-to-do, of the capitalists. They alone possessed the suffrage. Consequently, the remainder of the population was in a political sense of no importance. The legislation enacted during these eighteen years was class legislation, which favored the bourgeoisie and which made no attempt to meet the needs of the masses. Yet the distress of the masses was widespread and deep and should have appeared clear and ominous to the Government. Under the Restoration, but chiefly under Louis Philippe, France was passing from the old industrial system of small domestic manufacture to the new factory system, the application of machinery to industry on a large scale, the employment of the new motive force, steam. This transition was in every country painful, involving as it did a dislocation and clumsy maladjustment of forces, and giving rise to most vexatious labor questions. Capitalists who could give or withhold the chance of employment had the upper hand and knew it. Grossly excessive hours of labor were required, and women and children who could tend machines were sacrificed to the new system in a manner that had never been possible under the old. The strange new conditions, the manifest evils dangerous to mind and body, required new laws for the protection of the weaker class. But legislation lagged far behind. Employers were intent on exploiting their factories, their machines, their workmen to the fullest possible extent, and many were amassing large fortunes. They were not in-

Economic distress.

Introduction of the factory system.

Condition of the working classes.

terested in lessening the misery which the new order provisionally caused. And the law of France forbade the workmen themselves to combine for purposes of improving their condition. Ignorant, poor, lacking leadership, without political power, smarting under a sense of oppression and injustice, they were the inevitable enemies of a régime that passed them by, giving them no heed. In 1831 the silk-weavers of Lyons, earning the pitiful wage of eighteen sous a day for a day of eighteen hours, had risen in insurrection under the despairing banner, "We will live by working or die fighting."

Growth of socialism.

Such conditions provoked discussion and many writers began to preach new doctrines concerning the organization of industry and the crucial question of the relations of capital and labor, doctrines henceforth called socialistic, and appealing with increasing force to the millions of laborers who believed that society weighed with unjustifiable severity upon them, that their labor did not by any means receive its proportionate reward. St. Simon was the first to announce a socialistic scheme for the reorganization of society in the interest of the most numerous class. He believed that the state should own the means of production and should organize industry on the principle of "Labor according to capacity and reward according to services." St. Simon was a speculative thinker, not a practical man of affairs. His doctrine gained in direct importance when it was adopted by a man who was a politician, able to recruit and lead a party, and to make a programme definite enough to appeal to the masses. Such a man was Louis Blanc, who was destined to play a great part in the overthrow of the July Monarchy and in the Republic that succeeded. In his writings he tried to convince the laborers of France of the evils of the prevailing economic conditions, a task which was not difficult. He denounced in vehement terms the government of the bourgeoisie as government of the rich, by the rich, and for the rich. It must be swept away and

Louis Blanc, 1811-1882.

the state must be organized on a thoroughly democratic basis. This was the condition precedent to all success. Only then and with the full power of the state at their disposal could the laboring classes work out their own salvation. The state, organized as a democratic republic, should then create so-called national or social workshops, advancing the necessary capital. These would be controlled by the workers who would share the proceeds. They would gradually supersede the existing workshops or factories, controlled and directed by the private individuals who had supplied the capital and who appropriated the profits. Private competition would give way to co-operative production. The individual producers would disappear. Louis Blanc's theories, propounded in a style at once clear and vivid, were largely adopted by workingmen. A socialist party was thus created. This party threatened the existence of the monarchy; it also threatened the industrial and commercial system in vogue. It believed in a republic as the only government that the democracy could hope to control; but it differed from the other republicans in that, while they desired simply a change in the form of government, it desired a far more sweeping change in society. As early as 1842 a German named Stein wrote: "The time for purely political movements in France is past; the next revolution must inevitably be a *social* revolution."

Widespread opposition to the policy of the Government.

Thus it is evident that the amount of discontent with the Government of France was great and growing. From nearly every quarter enemies arose. These enemies differed from each other—they might not be able to co-operate in constructive work, but they could co-operate in destroying the existing system. There were the moderate Orleanists, convinced friends of monarchy, who were repelled by the prevalent corruption of Parliament and wished to end it; there were the convinced Republicans, silenced but not suppressed; there were the Socialists, democratic, republican. The volume of discontent was increased by the unpopular character

of the foreign policy of the ministry, which appeared humiliatingly submissive to England on certain occasions, too desirous of pleasing the absolute and reactionary monarchs of central Europe on others, too cold towards Liberals everywhere, too pettily personal, also, in that one of its aims was the advancement of the dynastic ambitions of Louis Philippe, who sought to promote by marriage alliances the fortunes of his family, even at the expense of the interests of the nation which he ruled.

Fusion of the opposing parties.

These various groups, exceedingly dissatisfied with the existing order, converged in 1848, though unintentionally and unsympathetically, toward the most violent and reckless upheaval France had known since 1789—a movement initiated by the moderate Monarchists, rapidly furthered by the Republicans, and in the end partly dominated by the Socialists. Each of these parties was by conviction and by temperament violently opposed to the other. The immediate occasion for their co-operation was furnished by the continued demand for electoral and parliamentary reform.

The electoral and parliamentary corruption of the July Monarchy has been described. Year after year the ministry had proved itself stronger and had defiantly resisted all proposals. The King was fatuously opposed to reform in itself. Guizot, believing in growth, nevertheless held that the time had not yet come for any alteration in the prevailing system. Beating against this wall, which seemed to grow higher and more solid each year, the Opposition came to see that there was no hope of overthrowing the obstructionist ministry by ordinary parliamentary methods.

The "reform banquets."

Guizot constantly asserted that the demand for reform was simply brought forward for political purposes, that it was the work of a few, that the people as a whole were entirely indifferent. To prove the falsity of this assertion the Opposition instituted in 1847 a series of "reform ban-

quets," which were to be attended by the people and addressed by the reformers. Petitions for reform were to be circulated on these occasions. Thus popular pressure would be brought to bear on Parliament and King. These banquets were instituted by those loyal to the monarchy, but hostile to its policy. They simply wished to change the latter. Similar meetings, however, were instituted by the Republicans, who were opposed to the very existence of the monarchy. On the 18th of July, 1847, Lamartine, now rapidly advancing as a leader of the latter party, prophesied a coming revolution. "If the monarchy," said he, "is unfaithful to the hopes that the wisdom of the country reposed in 1830, less in its nature than in its name, if it surrounds itself with an electoral aristocracy rather than unites the entire nation, if it allows us to descend into the abyss of corruption, rest assured that the monarchy will fall, not in its own blood as did that of 1789, but in the trap it itself has set. And after having experienced revolutions of liberty and counter-revolutions of glory, you will have a revolution of the public conscience and a revolution of contempt."

Emergence of Lamartine.

Great enthusiasm was aroused by these informal plébiscites all over the country during the summer and fall of 1847. It was conclusively shown that the people were behind this demand for reform. But the monarchy remained unaffected—still gave its systematic refusal. The King denounced in his speech from the throne this agitation "fomented by hostile or blind passions." He denied the legal right of the people to hold such meetings. To test this right before the courts of law the Opposition arranged a great banquet for February 22, 1848, in Paris. Eighty-seven prominent deputies promised to attend. All were to meet in front of the church of the Madeleine and march to the banquet hall. In the night of February 21-22 the Government posted orders forbidding this procession and all similar meetings. Rather than force the issue the deputies who had agreed to attend yielded, though under pro-

The people support the demand for reform.

test. But a vast crowd congregated, of students, workingmen, and others. They had no leader, no definite purpose. The crowd committed slight acts of lawlessness, but nothing serious happened that day. But in the night barricades arose in the workingmen's quarters of the city. Some shots were fired. The Government called out the National Guard. It refused to march against the insurgents. Some of its members even began to shout, "Long live Reform!" "Down with Guizot!" The King, frightened at this alarming aspect, was willing to grant reform. Guizot would not consent and consequently withdrew from office. This news was greeted with enthusiasm by the crowds and, in the evening of February 23d, Paris was illuminated and the trouble seemed ended. The contest thus far had been simply between Royalists, those who supported the Guizot ministry, and the reformers, and the fall of Guizot was the triumph of the latter. But the movement no longer remained thus circumscribed. The Republicans now entered aggressively upon the scene, resolved to arouse the excited people against Louis Philippe himself and against the monarchy. They marched through the boulevards and made a hostile demonstration before Guizot's residence. Some unknown person fired a shot at the guards. The guards instantly replied, fifty persons fell, more than twenty dead. This was the doom of the monarchy. The Republicans seized the occasion to inflame the people further. Several of the corpses were put upon a cart which was lighted by a torch. The cart was then drawn through the streets. The ghastly spectacle aroused everywhere the angriest passions; cries of "Vengeance!" followed it along its course. From the towers the tocsin sounded its wild and sinister appeal.

Resignation of Guizot.

The overthrow of Louis Philippe.

Thus began a riot which grew in vehemence hourly, and which swept all before it. The cries of "Long live Reform!" heard the day before, now gave way to the more ominous cries of "Long live the Republic!" Finally, on February 24th, the King abdicated in favor of his grandson, the

little Count of Paris, who should be King Louis Philippe II, and whose mother, the Duchess of Orleans, should be regent. The royal family left the Tuileries and escaped from Paris in safety. Another French king took the road to England and entered upon a life of exile, which was to end only with death in 1850.

The Government of France had been swallowed up by another revolution. The King and the minister were overthrown. Who would succeed them? The King had abdicated in favor of his grandson. But would the revolutionists recognize him? The Duchess of Orleans with great bravery went directly to the Chamber of Deputies with her two sons, nine and seven years old. A painful scene followed. The majority of the deputies hailed her as regent and her son as king, but soon the mob, consisting of the students, the Republicans, and Socialists who had forced the abdication, invaded the Chamber. The president declared the session closed. The mob continued in the hall, re-enforced by new armed bands, which denounced the idea of a regency, denounced the Chamber and the deputies, and cried "No more Bourbons; a Provisional Government and after that the Republic." Out of this wild turmoil by no legal method arose a new system. The republican deputies finally declared the House of Orleans deposed and proclaimed a Provisional Government and Lamartine read a list of seven names of those who should compose it. All were deputies. This list had been previously drawn up at the office of the *National*, the leading liberal newspaper. The crowd in the hall shouted their approval. This assembly did not proclaim the Republic.

The rise of the Second Republic.

While this government was arising in the Chamber, another movement was in progress, in another part of the city. The republican Socialists, meeting in the office of the *Reform*, their organ, had drawn up a list which had included the names on the list of the *National*, but had added to them three of their own number, among whom was Louis Blanc.

These established themselves in the Hôtel de Ville and proclaimed the Republic. Thus there were two governments as a result of the insurrection. The members chosen in the Chamber traversed the streets of Paris to the Hôtel de Ville. There the two groups were fused. Positions were found in the new government for the members of both. The Republic was immediately proclaimed, subject to ratification by the people.

CHAPTER VII

CENTRAL EUROPE BETWEEN TWO REVOLUTIONS

PRUSSIA

The February Revolution a signal for other revolutions.

The French Revolution of 1848 was the signal for the most wide-reaching disturbance of the century. Revolutions broke out from the Baltic to the Mediterranean, from France to the Russian frontier. The whole system of reaction, which had succeeded Waterloo and which had come to be personified in the imperturbable Metternich, crashed in unutterable confusion. But in order to understand the swiftness and completeness of this collapse, one must know something of the evolution of central Europe between 1830 and 1848, for the revolutions of 1848 were no sudden and accidental improvisations, but were simply the decisive and dramatic culmination of movements everywhere making for change. The Revolution of 1848 was a signal and an encouragement to other peoples to attempt similar things; it was not a cause. Particularly necessary is it to trace the inner evolution of Germany, Austria, and Italy during this period, which was not at all one of stagnation, but one characterized by a great and fruitful fermentation of ideas.

The general character of the period.

The interest of German history between 1830 and 1848 does not lie in the evolution of political liberty, for political repression and absolutism were the order of the day. It lies rather in growth along economic lines, in intellectual achievements outside the domain of politics, and in those movements of opinion and of racial aspiration which rendered so notable and far-reaching the vast turmoil of 1848.

For German history the all-important matter is the evolution during those years of a remarkable situation in both Prussia and Austria, which was highly favorable to revolutions in the fulness of time. The Confederation as a whole had no evolution, but was a sleeping, hollow mockery. The evolution of the lesser states, important no doubt, must be neglected in a study of this scope. The ideas, personalities, tendencies, and situations that were to prove determinant for central Europe, came not from them but from the two first-class powers already named, which stood confronting each other in the Confederation and in Europe as a whole, rendering unity impossible, and both opposed to liberty.

Evolution of Prussia.

And first of the evolution of Prussia during these years. Political liberty, as we have seen, was denied. No constitution was granted, no parliament created, but it would not be reasonable to emphasize that fact unduly. Their absence was not acutely felt save by a small enlightened minority. Such liberties Prussians had never known, and there were few serious practical grievances. The state was well administered. The king, Frederick William III (1797-1840), was honest and beloved, the administration hard-working and economical, the policies enlightened. The period between 1815 and 1848, though politically unimportant, was immensely significant in other ways. While university professors and students suspected of dabbling in politics were shamefully persecuted, the régime was not opposed to intellectual progress. Under it great advances were made in all branches of education from the lowest to the highest. Intellectual activity, forbidden to enter the political field, overflowed into others. It was a period of great and durable conquests in the domain of science, rich in leaders who held high the best traditions of scholarship and widened the bounds of human knowledge.

Great intellectual activity.

The great political achievements of the period lay in the administrative and economic questions met and solved by Prussian statesmen. Prussia had to undergo the most thor-

ough reorganization. Before German unity could be achieved Prussian unity must be secured. The treaties of 1815 had transformed Prussia by almost doubling her territory and her population. Out of ten million inhabitants five million were new subjects, difficult to assimilate: the inhabitants of the Rhenish provinces had been for twenty years a part of the French Empire and were strongly attached to French ideas; the Poles still bitterly regretted the loss of their former independence; the Saxons resented their annexation to Prussia. These peoples did not feel themselves Prussians, though fate had put them under a Prussian king. The task of building anew the Prussian state out of such varied elements, of making a thoroughly homogeneous kingdom, was rendered all the more difficult from the fact that Prussia was divided into two separate, unconnected parts, an eastern and a western, separated by Hanover, Brunswick, and Hesse-Cassel. Her boundaries were not those of a healthy state. These were the problems whose solution would take time. Meanwhile certain definite reforms were undertaken.

The achievement of Prussian unity imperative.

The financial question was the most urgent, and this was faced heroically. The burden of the Napoleonic wars had been tremendous. The Prussian debt was large; deficits were usual. By revising her system of taxation, and by rigid economy, order was finally brought about, there were surpluses instead of deficits, and in 1828 government bonds stood at par.

Revision of the system of taxation.

The great interest of the Prussian Government in the material development and prosperity of the country was best shown in its tariff policy. Prussia, as has been said, was divided into two unequal and unconnected parts. The boundaries were very extensive, increased still further by the fact that entirely within her territory lay states or fragments of other states independent of her. Moreover, the economic conditions in the eastern part of the realm were essentially different from those in the western; the

The question of the tariff.

one agricultural, the other industrial. There was nothing like freedom of trade between the different parts. Indeed, there were in old Prussia alone sixty-seven different tariff systems in operation, separating district from district. Cities were shut off from the surrounding country districts by tariff walls, and province from province. All this meant that commerce could not flourish, hampered on every side, and that industries, the support of commerce, could not expand, owing to narrow and uncertain markets. Under these conditions one industry thrived—smuggling. The smugglers' trade was easy, owing to the fact that the frontiers to be guarded were over 4,000 miles long, a line that could only be guarded by a very large number of customs officials, which would involve great expense. All this was changed in 1818, under the influence of a great financial reformer, Maassen. All internal customs were abolished and free trade was established throughout all Prussia. Then a tariff, very simple and covering few commodities, was established against the rest of the world. This tariff was put low enough to make smuggling unprofitable. Products that would be brought over sea were taxed higher, as they must enter by the few ports, which could be easily guarded. Having established a common tariff for her own kingdom, Prussia sought to induce other German states to enter into union with her, to adopt the same tariff against other nations and free trade with each other. She offered to share the total revenues collected pro rata according to population. The other states protested vehemently at first against what they considered the high-handed measures of the larger state, but they finally saw the advantages of union. The first to join were those which were entirely inclosed or which had parts entirely inclosed by Prussia; whose commerce with the outside world must be through Prussian territory.

The Zollverein.

Between 1819 and 1828 the little Thuringian duchies entered this Zollverein, or Tariff Union. The southern and central states of Germany held aloof and even formed rival tariff

unions of their own. These, however, did not prosper. One by one the other states joined the Prussian Union, led thereto by the apparent advantages of free trade with each other and by Prussia's liberal terms. By 1842 all, save the Hanseatic towns and Mecklenburg, Hanover, and Austria, had joined. The treaties between the co-operating states upon which the union rested were made for brief periods, but were constantly renewed.

The advantages of the Zollverein.

The advantages of the Zollverein were both economic and political. Industry grew rapidly by the application of the principle of free trade to the states of Germany. It created a real national unity in economic matters, at a time when Germany was politically only the semblance of a union; it accustomed German states to co-operation without Austria, and it taught them the advantages of Prussian leadership. Men began to see that a Germany could exist without Austria. The Zollverein is generally considered in a very real sense to have been the beginning of German unity.

Death of Frederick William III.

As long as Frederick William III lived it was recognized that no changes would be made in the political institutions of Prussia. It was tacitly understood that his declining years should not be disturbed, that the demands for reforms should not be pressed. But when he died in 1840, says von Treitschke, "all the long pent up grievances and hopes of Prussia overflowed irresistibly, gushing and foaming like molten metal when the spigot is knocked out." All eyes were now turned upon his son and successor, Frederick William IV.

Frederick William IV, 1795-1861.

The new King, forty-five years of age, was already well known as a man of unusual intellectual gifts—quick, mobile, enthusiastic, imaginative, an eloquent conversationalist and public speaker. He was a patron of learning, surrounding himself with scholars, artists, and writers. Goethe had said of him that "so great a talent must awaken new talents in others." From his general intellectual restlessness and liberality much was hoped, as it was also known that he had

latterly not approved the policy of his father. This impression he confirmed by his acts at the opening of his reign. He issued an amnesty pardoning political prisoners. He restored Arndt to his professorship at Bonn. He released Jahn. In a series of impassioned utterances he spoke glowingly of Prussia's destiny. It seemed that a new and liberal era was dawning.

But disillusionment soon began. The people wanted reforms and expected them from the new King. His predecessor had consented to the creation of local diets for local concerns in each of the provinces into which Prussia was divided. He had promised a central parliament but had not kept the promise. The demand now was for this. Would Frederick William IV grant it? This question was asked him by the estates of the Province of Prussia. His answer was kindly and vague. A little later a real answer came in the form of an ordinance which somewhat increased the powers of the provincial estates and provided that delegations from each should unite in Berlin. This was not at all what was wanted. Several of the provincial estates demanded the fulfilment of the promises of 1815. Books appeared discussing constitutional questions. The press took the matter up vehemently, the censorship having been somewhat slackened. The King apparently made no effort to win back the favor of his people. His policy was evidently purely reactionary. Popular meetings were forbidden in certain provinces; the press, too free for his satisfaction, was shackled again. Even the independence of the judiciary was threatened.

The demand for a parliament.

Year after year went by and the people became impatient because no parliament was created. The King, meanwhile wavering between the most exalted notions of the divine origin and nature of his position and his desire to live in harmony with his age, sketched plan after plan of an assembly which should not be representative, which should cooperate with him, and which should quiet the insistent clamor

of his people. Finally, on February 3, 1847, he issued a Letter Patent which marks the beginning of the constitutional history of Prussia. By this Patent it was announced that the king would summon all the provincial assemblies to meet in one general assembly or United Landtag whenever the needs of the state should demand new loans, the levying of new taxes, or the augmentation of those already existing. The United Landtag was to have the right of petition, and the king might consult it in regard to new legislation. There were to be two chambers, meeting apart, except when considering financial questions, the former a chamber of lords, the other of the three estates. At first enthusiastic, the people were shortly chagrined at the outcome of all their efforts. The Landtag was not to meet at definite periods but only when the king should summon it. It was to resemble a medieval diet more than a modern parliament. Even its power in financial matters was greatly limited. All discussion involving the tariff was reserved for the Zollverein. Provincial and local taxes remained to be determined absolutely by the crown. In case of war the Government might increase the existing taxes, being merely obliged to bring the matter to the attention of the next Landtag. Even the right of petition was carefully restricted. The king would receive petitions only when two-thirds of both houses had agreed upon them.

The Letter Patent of February, 1847.

This was not the constitution the people had been so long demanding. By it the king was not required ever to call the United Landtag together. Moreover, he retained the complete law-making power and an almost unrestricted power over the nation's purse. The new parliament was to represent, not the people, but social classes.

Popular dissatisfaction.

Moreover, in the speech from the throne, with which Frederick William IV opened this assembly in the following April, he took particular pains to state that this Patent was no constitution creating a parliament representing the people of Prussia. "Never will I allow," he said, "a sheet

of written paper to come, like a second Providence, between our Lord God in Heaven and this land, to govern us by its paragraphs. The crown cannot and ought not to depend upon the will of majorities. I should never have called you together if I had the least idea that you could dream of playing the part of so-called representatives of the people."

Conflict between Frederick William IV and the United Landtag.

A conflict began at once between the King and the United Landtag, which developed into a deadlock. The Landtag demanded a real parliament. The King demanded loans. Neither yielded to the other, and in June 1847 the Landtag was dissolved. Nothing had been accomplished. A grave constitutional crisis had been created. The monarch stood in direct opposition to the Liberals. Such was the dangerously overheated state of the public mind when news of the revolution in Paris reached Berlin.

AUSTRIA

Austria not a homogeneous state.

The history of Austria between 1815 and 1848 resembles in some respects that of the German Confederation in that it was not the evolution of a single homogeneous state. Movements proceeded from several local centers. For purposes of simplification it is well to examine each in turn. In the provinces of Austria proper, in the western part of the empire, the movement took the form of a demand for the diminution of the autocratic system. There, as elsewhere in Europe, after 1840 a popular feeling that the time had come for larger liberty was distinctly perceptible. Yet there the difficulty of its achievement was at its maximum. For as long as Francis I lived there was no hope of sympathy from the throne. His successor, Ferdinand I (1835-48), was a man of less ability and was, moreover, mentally incapacitated for rule. This meant that Metternich and his colleagues exercised nearly uncontrolled power.

Political stagnation.

During this period little change occurred in the conditions of the Austrian provinces. Liberal opinions could not be

freely published owing to the severity of the censorship; yet there were a few journalists and lawyers who managed to express a desire for some measure of political freedom and for a constitution. One significant feature of the time was the transition from the old to the new in the economic sphere. The introduction of machinery, bringing with it the factory system, was now accomplished, and was accompanied by the terrible evils which had marked this transition in England and in France. Many laborers were thrown out of work, wandered about the country, demoralized, starving, and drifted to the cities, particularly to Vienna, forming a desperate element, easily incited to deeds of violence, as the issue was to show. An industrial crisis preceded the political crisis of 1848 and profoundly influenced its course.

The industrial revolution.

The period preceding 1848, politically of slight interest, was rendered notable by the development of the spirit of nationality among several of the varied peoples who had hitherto been quiescent under the House of Hapsburg. This was the most significant phenomenon of these years, as it was to be the most permanent in its effects. This feeling of separate individuality, this assertion of the rights of nationality, which is one of the principal features of the history of the nineteenth century everywhere, had come to be the most salient characteristic of Austrian evolution in particular, and is so still. Under the ægis of the House of Hapsburg several nations were arising and were struggling for a larger and more independent place in the collective state. This spirit was particularly pronounced in Bohemia and Hungary.

The development of nationalities within the empire.

Bohemia had been united with Austria since 1526. Its population consisted of Germans and of a branch of the Slavic race called Czechs. The Germans had for more than two centuries been preponderant. Their language was that of the government, of educated people, the language of literature and science, the Czechish being regarded as fit only for peasants. But after 1815 the popular conscious-

Bohemia.

ness gradually awoke. The idea that the Czechish nationality could be revived took strong hold of a few educated men who believed that Bohemia should be torn from German control and that the native Czechish element should be put in its place. The movement was at first confined to university men, was literary and scientific. A group of historians arose, of whom Palacky was the leader, who by their histories of Bohemia when she had been an independent kingdom, inculcated the wish that she might again be one. Pride was enlisted, too, by reviving a knowledge of the ancient native literature. Henceforth every Czech should cease to use German and speak his own native tongue. This movement grew, passing from university circles to the mass of the people. It was directed against the German office-holders in Bohemia and against the use of German in the government and in education. While during the period from 1815 to 1848 it accomplished no practical reform, it created a public opinion and a vehement aspiration for national independence that constituted an important factor in the general situation of that year.

Hungary. A more pronounced national and racial movement within the empire was going on at the same time in Hungary, a country peopled by several different races speaking different languages and possessing different institutions. The leading races were the Magyars; the Slavs, broken up into several branches, north and south of the Magyars; the Germans or Saxons; and the Roumanians. The Magyars, though numerically a minority of the whole people, were more numerous than any other one race, were the most developed politically, and had, ever since they had come into the country in the ninth century, regarded it as their own and had paid scant attention to the other races. Two sections of Hungary, Croatia, peopled almost entirely by Slavs, and Transylvania, the majority of whose inhabitants were Roumanians, were somewhat differentiated from Hungary proper, where the Magyars predominated, in that, though

annexed countries and subject to the king of Hungary, they enjoyed a certain measure of autonomy. Croatia, for instance, had a viceroy or ban and a Diet of its own. Transylvania had its Estates, infrequently convoked.

The Hungarian Constitution.

Hungary had a constitution dating in part from the thirteenth century. It was in 1222 that the Golden Bull of Andreas II was issued, nearly contemporary with Magna Charta. There was a Diet or Parliament meeting in Presburg in two chambers, or Tables, as they were called; a Table of Magnates, composed of the highest nobility, of certain of the higher clergy and office-holders; and a Table of Deputies, chosen by the congregations or county assemblies, and by the free cities. Hungary was divided into more than fifty counties, each one of which had its local assembly or congregation.

The importance of the nobility.

The nobility alone possessed political power. Only nobles sat in the national Diet, and only nobles were members of the county assemblies. The nobility was itself divided into two sections, the very wealthy, the Magnates, about five hundred in number, and the petty nobility, numbering perhaps seven hundred thousand, poor, in many cases uneducated and hardly to be distinguished from the peasants among whom they lived, save by their privileges. Everywhere feudalism flourished in its most flagrant form and perhaps as nowhere else in Europe. The aristocracy not only constituted all the assemblies, national and local, but they filled all the offices. They enjoyed old feudal dues and paid no taxes themselves. The very tax intended to defray the expense of the local administration, which they monopolized, was laid upon the class beneath. Their lands could be alienated only to members of their own order. Their palaces in the cities were not subject to municipal jurisdiction. The entire class of the bourgeoisie had only one vote in the Diet. Neither bourgeoisie nor the laboring class possessed any power. The immense mass of the population, the peasantry, were subject to a most oppressive serfdom.

The prevalence of feudalism.

It is evident that though Hungary had a constitution it was not of the modern type but of the medieval. To take a place among the progressive lands of Europe, Hungary needed to be brought within the region of modern ideas. One of those who saw this and whose whole activity was to contribute powerfully to this modernization, was Count Stephen Széchenyi, a great Hungarian Magnate who, himself an aristocrat, boldly told his fellow-aristocrats that the time for reform had come, that they must reform themselves, and must change radically the conditions of their country. He was rather a social than a political reformer, interested chiefly in the encouragement of material prosperity, which necessitated the removal of many abuses from which the aristocracy profited. He devoted his time, his money, and his immense prestige to social and economic improvement, to the draining of marshes, the building of roads and tunnels and bridges, the clearing of the Danube for navigation. His aim was to make Hungary a busy, prosperous, modern industrial state instead of an illustration of belated medievalism. He encouraged the foundation of learned societies, the use of the national language, the establishment of a national theater. His work was mainly outside the Diet and consisted chiefly of his vigorous writings and his example. He was not a political revolutionist, not an enemy of Austria. The spirit in which he worked was shown by his admonition to his countrymen: "Do not constantly trouble yourselves with the vanished glories of the past, but rather let your determined patriotism bring about the prosperity of the beloved fatherland. Many there are who think that *Hungary has been,* but I for my part like to think that *Hungary shall be.*"

Széchenyi and reform.

The policy of the Diet.

Meanwhile the Diet, controlled in both houses by the Magyar aristocracy, accomplished little in the direction of reform. It was not willing to curtail its own privileges. But, on the other hand, it was willing to assert itself against the Austrian Government, to attempt to gain a larger in-

dependence for Hungary in the collective state. One gain it made—that concerning the Magyar language.

The language question.

Latin was the language used in the Hungarian Diet. It was the language of the Roman Catholic Church and had formerly been the language of diplomacy. In a country where so many tongues were spoken its use seemed a felicitous arrangement, favoring no one race. It was neutral. But the Magyars, now alive with the spirit of self-assertion, sought to depose Latin and to place Magyar in its stead as the official language. This they finally achieved in 1844. The Croatian deputies, on the other hand, wished still to speak Latin, but were not permitted to. The Magyars showed that their desire was not the freedom of the several peoples of which Hungary was composed, but only their own freedom, indeed, the freedom to impose their will upon others. Their object was the complete Magyarization of all who lived in Hungary, were they Croatians, Servians, Roumanians, or what else. In this struggle over language lay the germ of a conflict of races which was later to be most disastrous to the Magyars themselves. They were not willing to grant to others the rights which they had demanded for themselves.

Rise of a radical party.

While the Hungarian Diet was zealous in asserting the claims of Hungary against Austrian domination, and was eager to air Hungarian grievances against the Imperial Government, it refused to undertake any large measure of internal reform. The Magnates, intent upon the preservation of their unrivaled position, blocked the way of even those changes which the other chamber, representative of the numerous lower nobility, was disposed to grant. Gradually there grew up as a result a party much more radical, nourished in the ideas of western Europe, democratic, and believing that the existing medieval institutions, the Diet and the county assemblies, must be thoroughly reorganized or swept away before the new ideas could be worked out. This Liberal party was led by Louis Kossuth, one of

Louis Kossuth, 1802-1894.

Hungary's greatest heroes, and Francis Deák, whose personality is less striking, but whose services to his country were to be more solid and enduring. Kossuth had first come into notice as the editor of a paper which described in vivid and liberal vein the debates in the Diet. When it was forbidden to print these reports he had them lithographed. When this was forbidden he had them written out by hand by a corps of amanuenses and distributed by servants. Finally he was arrested and sentenced to prison. During his imprisonment of three years Kossuth applied himself to serious studies, particularly to that of the English language, with such success that he was able later to address large audiences in England and the United States with remarkable effect. In 1840 he was released and obtained permission to edit a daily paper.

After 1840 the mass of the nation turned away from Széchenyi and toward Kossuth and Deák. Széchenyi, a Magnate, wished the gradual reform of his country from above, and had no sympathy with democratic movements. Kossuth, on the other hand, was the very incarnation of the great democratic ideas of the age. Sharing fully Széchenyi's desire to place Hungary in the front rank of modern nations, to develop its material prosperity, its civilization, he did not believe it possible to accomplish this by the methods hitherto followed, and without a thoroughly modern constitutional government. He believed that free political institutions contribute directly to material well-being and to civilization.

Kossuth, now as a brilliant editor and as an even more brilliant orator, conducted an agitation that had little in common with the reform movement of the Liberals up to this time. He did not believe that the necessary reforms could ever be brought about by existing agencies—either by the Diet or by the powerful county assemblies, both controlled by the nobility. He wished to erase all distinctions between noble and non-noble, to fuse all into one common

whole. He demanded democratic reforms in every department of the national life; abolition of the privileges of the nobility and of their exemption from taxation; equal rights and equal burdens for all citizens; trial by jury; reform of the criminal code. Kossuth's impassioned appeals were made directly to the people. He sought to create, and did create, a powerful public opinion clamorous for change. This vigorous liberal opposition to the established order, an opposition ably led and full of fire, grew rapidly. In 1847 it published its programme, drawn up by Deák. This demanded the taxation of the nobles, the control by the Diet of all national expenditures, larger liberty for the press, and a complete right of public meeting and association; it demanded also that Hungary should not be subordinate to Austrian policy, and to the Austrian provinces. Such was the situation when the great reform wave of 1848 began to sweep over Europe.

The demands of the Hungarians in 1847.

ITALY

The Italian revolutions of 1820 and 1821, and of 1831 and 1832 had had no depth of root, no powers of endurance and had been easily crushed out by a few thousand Austrian bayonets. The humiliation of liberal-minded Italians was great indeed. It was clear to all that the methods hitherto employed would be inadequate to the end. The next fifteen years were devoted to a deeper study of the problem, to the elaboration of several plans for its solution, to the long and patient processes of preparing for an independent national existence a people sorely lacking the most essential elements characteristic of such a state. During this period a group of writers figure with unusual prominence. The previous revolutions had failed, partly at least, because of the narrow basis on which they rested. Disaffected army circles and members of a loosely organized, incompetently directed secret society, the Carbonari, had attempted these insurrections. The basis was narrow at best; moreover, the Italians had

Italy after 1831.

Importance of a group of writers.

not yet learned the fundamental necessity of solidarity. Insurrections were pitifully local; Italians of different states rendered each other no assistance, or only the slightest, in movements that would have a common advantage for all and that to succeed must have the support of all. It was imperative that a universal mental state be created, that a common aspiration characterize the liberal elements everywhere, that an Italy of the imagination and affection should exist, even if the Italy of reality was only an expression of geography. All Italians must hold a common set of political ideas, whether they be Piedmontese, Sicilians, Venetians, or subjects of the Pope. To bring this about was the work of several gifted men, working mainly through the channel of literature.

Joseph Mazzini, 1805-1872.

Foremost among these was Joseph Mazzini. Mazzini was the spiritual force of the Italian resurrection, the prophet of a state that was not yet but was to be, destined from youth to feel with extraordinary intensity a holy mission imposed upon him. He was born in 1805 in Genoa, his father being a physician and a professor in the university. Even in his boyhood he was morbidly impressed with the unhappiness and misery of his country. "In the midst of the noisy, tumultuous life of the students around me I was," he says, in his interesting though fragmentary autobiography, "somber and absorbed and appeared like one suddenly grown old. I childishly determined to dress always in black, fancying myself in mourning for my country." It was after the failure of 1821 that Mazzini first became conscious of the mission of his life. While walking one Sunday with his mother and a friend in the streets of Genoa, they were addressed, he says, "by a tall, dark-bearded man with a severe, energetic countenance and a fiery glance that I have never since forgotten. He held out a white handkerchief towards us, merely saying, 'For the refugees of Italy.'" The incident, simple as it was, made a profound impression upon Mazzini's ardent nature. "The idea of an

existing wrong in my country against which it was a duty to struggle, and the thought that I, too, must bear my part in that struggle, flashed before my mind on that day, for the first time, never again to leave me. The remembrance of those refugees, many of whom became my friends in after life, pursued me wherever I went by day and mingled with my dreams by night. I would have given, I know not what, to follow them. I began collecting names and facts, and studied as best I might the records of that heroic struggle, seeking to fathom the causes of its failure."

His intense patriotism.

As Mazzini grew up all his inclinations were toward a literary life. "A thousand visions of historical dramas and romances floated before my mental eye." But this dream he abandoned, "my first great sacrifice," for political agitation. He joined the Carbonari, not because he approved even then of their methods, but because at least they were a revolutionary organization. As a member of it, he was arrested in 1830. The governor of Genoa told Mazzini's father that his son was "gifted with some talent," but was "too fond of walking by himself at night absorbed in thought. What on earth has he at his age to think about? We don't like young people thinking without our knowing the subject of their thoughts." Mazzini was imprisoned in the fortress of Savona. Here he could only see the sky and the sea, "the two grandest things in Nature, except the Alps," he said. After six months he was released, but was forced to leave his country. For nearly all of forty years he was to lead the bitter life of an exile in France, in Switzerland, but chiefly in England, which became his second home.

His imprisonment.

After his release from prison Mazzini founded in 1831 a society, "Young Italy," destined to be an important factor in making the new Italy. The Carbonari had led two revolutions and had failed. Moreover, he disliked that organization as being merely destructive in its aim, having no definite plan of reconstruction. "Revolutions," he said, "must be made by the people and for the people." His own society must

Founder of "Young Italy."

be a secret organization; otherwise it would be stamped out. But it must not be merely a body of conspirators; it must be educative, proselyting, seeking to win Italians by its moral and intellectual fervor to an idealistic view of life, a self-sacrificing sense of duty. Only those under forty were to be admitted to membership, because his appeal was particularly to the young. "Place youth at the head of the insurgent multitude," he said, "you know not the secret of the power hidden in these youthful hearts, nor the magic influence exercised on the masses by the voice of youth. You will find among the young a host of apostles of the new religion." With Mazzini the liberation and unification of Italy was indeed a new religion, appealing to the loftiest emotions, entailing complete self-sacrifice, complete absorption in the ideal, and the young were to be its apostles. Theirs was to be a missionary life. He told them to travel, to bear from land to land, from village to village, the torch of liberty, to expound its advantages to the people, to establish and consecrate the cult. He told them to "climb the mountains and share the humble food of the laborer; to visit the workshops and the artizans; to speak to them of their rights, of the memories of their past, of their past glories, of their former commerce; to recount to them the endless oppression of which they were ignorant, because no one took it upon himself to reveal it." Let them not quail before the horrors of torture and imprisonment that might await them in the holy cause. "Ideas grow quickly when watered with the blood of martyrs." Never did a cause have a more dauntless leader, a man of purity of life, a man of imagination, of poetry, of audacity, gifted, moreover, with a marvelous command of persuasive language. The response was overwhelming. By 1833 the society reckoned 60,000 members. Branches were founded everywhere. Garibaldi, whose name men were later to conjure with, joined it on the shores of the Black Sea. This is the romantic proselyting movement of the nineteenth century, all the

The methods of the society.

more remarkable from the fact that its members were unknown men, bringing to their work no advantage of wealth or social position. But, as their leader wrote later, "All great national movements begin with the unknown men of the people, without influence except for the faith and will that counts not time or difficulties."

The aims of the society.

The programme of this society was clear and emphatic. First, Austria must be driven out. This was the condition precedent to all success. War must come—the sooner the better. Let not Italians rely on the aid of foreign governments, upon diplomacy, but upon their own unaided strength. Austria could not stand against a nation of twenty millions fighting for their rights.

Unity a practicable ideal.

At a time when the obstacles seemed insuperable, when but few Italians dreamed of unity even as an ultimate ideal, Mazzini declared that it was a practicable ideal, that the seemingly impossible was easily possible if only Italians would dare to show their power; and his great significance in Italian history is that he succeeded in imparting his burning faith to multitudes of others. "The one thing wanting to twenty millions of Italians, desirous of emancipating themselves, is not power, but *faith*," he said. His life was one long apostolate, devoted to the preaching of the true gospel. His writings thrilled with confidence and hope. "Young Italy must be neither a sect nor a party, but a faith and an apostolate." But if Italy were united what should be its form of government? Mazzini believed that it should be a republic, because sovereignty resides essentially in the people, and can only completely express itself in that form. Moreover, "our great memories are republican," and "there are no monarchical elements in Italy," no dynasty rendered illustrious by glory or by important services to Italy, "no powerful and respected aristocracy to take the intermediate place between the throne and the people." That a solution of the Italian problem lay in combining the existing states into a federation, Mazzini did not for a moment

believe. Every argument for federation was a stronger argument for unity. "Never rise in any other name than that of Italy and of all Italy."

Mazzini as a conspirator.

Mazzini's work, when it passed from the realms of exhortation, of ideas, to practice, proved ineffective. Young Italy attempted several insurrections which were less important and less successful than those conducted by the Carbonari. He himself lacked some of the qualities of practical leadership. He was dogmatic, intolerant. He underestimated the strength of the opposition. As a man of action he was not successful. Nevertheless is he one of the chief of the makers of Italy. He and the society which he founded constituted a leavening, quickening force in the realm of ideas. Around them grew up a patriotism for a country that existed as yet only in the imagination. Their influence even reached the king of Piedmont, who had driven Mazzini into exile and who kept him there. "Ah, Ricci," said Charles Albert, "the form of governments is not eternal; we shall march with the times."

But to many serious students of the Italian problem Mazzini seemed far too radical; seemed a mystic and a rhetorician full of resounding and thrilling phrases, but with little practical sense. Men of conservative temperament could not follow him. Repelled by the needless waste of life in small and pitifully weak insurrections, alienated by the sweeping character of his demands, these moderate reformers thought that the problem was of a different nature and ought to receive a different solution. They began about 1840 to express their views in books which were widely read and which exerted a considerable influence.

Gioberti, 1801-1852.

One of these was "The Moral and Civil Primacy of the Italians," a book by a Piedmontese priest, Gioberti, forced, like Mazzini, to live abroad in exile many years because of his radicalism. Gioberti believed that as Italy had been the fatherland of Dante and Napoleon, so it must always be the "home of creative genius." If so, it must occupy

no less a position in the world than independence. He believed in independence as fervidly as did Mazzini, but he did not believe in the possibility of Italian unity, for Italy had been too long divided. The divisions were deep-seated, historic, insuperable. Unity could never be brought about by peaceful methods, and ought never to be attempted by force. Gioberti believed in a federation of the states of Italy under the presidency or leadership of the Pope. Thus Italy would be secure from foreign aggression or control and a free field would be opened for all kinds of internal improvement. He held that the genius of Italy was monarchical and aristocratic, whereas Mazzini had declared it to be republican and democratic. He believed that the futility of conspiracies and secret societies and insurrections had been proved, that they did not further but hindered the cause. He concurred with Mazzini in believing in independence.

D'Azeglio, 1798-1866.

But to many who did not agree with Mazzini, Gioberti's idea that hope lay in the Pope seemed preposterous. This attitude was expressed by D'Azeglio in his "Recent Events in Romagna" (1846), a scathing commentary on the wretched misgovernment of the Pope within his own dominions, a vivid portrayal of the evils under which his subjects groaned. D'Azeglio also denounced the republican attempts at insurrection. Hope lay, in his opinion, in the king of Piedmont.

Balbo, 1789-1853.

Still another point of view was represented by Cesare Balbo in his "Hopes of Italy" (1844). He too was a Piedmontese. He did not believe in unity; that was a madman's dream. Like Gioberti, he believed in federation, but federation could not be accomplished as long as Austria remained an Italian power. "Without national independence other good things are as nought." Austria then must be eliminated, but how? Not by a war against her of the Italian people or of the Italian princes, nor yet by foreign aid, but by the disruption of the Turkish Empire, which he

felt to be near at hand. Might not Austria expand eastward at the expense of the Sultan, and might she not then "make Italy a present of her independence?" Certainly a fanciful idea. Balbo pointed out the defects of the Italian character, and urged his countrymen to cast off their indolence, to cease to be "the land of the olive and the orange," and to develop strength and earnestness of character.

The Risorgimento.

Out of this fermentation of ideas grew a more vigorous spirit of unrest, of dissatisfaction, of aspiration. This is the beginning of what is called in Italian the Risorgimento—the resurrection. Although ideas of how that resurrection should be brought about were at variance with each other, every utterance urged it forward. No political party was organized, but a general state of mind was created which held that Italy must become independent, which meant that Austrian influence must be eliminated, and that the Italians could do this themselves, if they only would. The watchword was given by Charles Albert, King of Piedmont. When asked how this great work could be accomplished, he said, "Italia fara da se," Italy will do it alone.

Pius IX, Pope, 1846-1878.

Events in the realm of politics only intensified the effect of these books, seeming to open wide the door of hope. In 1846 a new Pope was elected, Pius IX. It was considered auspicious that he was chosen by the anti-Austrian members of the conclave. He was known to have read Gioberti. His first acts were liberal. He pardoned political offenders, thus condemning his predecessor's policy. He appointed a commission to consider the question of railways, whose introduction had been opposed by his predecessor, one reason having been, it was said, his belief that they would "work harm to religion." He protested against the Austrian occupation of Ferrara. Metternich viewed this tendency with alarm. He had previously said that a liberal Pope was an impossibility. Now that there appeared to be one, he declared it the greatest misfortune of the age. The Pope's statement "that he was resolved to preserve all his author-

ity" passed unheeded in the momentary enthusiasm. "Be a believer," wrote Mazzini to him, "and unite Italy."

Reforms were speedily granted in Tuscany and in Piedmont by the princes, stimulated by the spectacle of a reforming Pope. A citizens' guard was established in the former, that is, the people were given arms. This they believed would henceforth make despotism impossible. Charles Albert of Piedmont, hitherto called the "Hesitating King," because of his constant vacillation between absolutism and liberalism, now veered toward the latter, influenced by the action of the Pope and by the consensus of ideas represented in the Risorgimento. In October 1847 he issued a decree granting many reforms in local government, the organization of the police, and the censorship of the press. Shortly afterward he proclaimed the civil emancipation of Protestants. These reforms were received with great enthusiasm, an enthusiasm vastly augmented by a letter which he sent at this time to a scientific congress in which he said: "If Providence sends us a war of Italian independence I will mount my horse with my sons. I will place myself at the head of an army. . . . What a glorious day it will be in which we can raise the cry of a war for the independence of Italy!"

Charles Albert, King of Piedmont.

In January 1848 a revolution broke out in the Kingdom of Naples, the first of that year of revolutions. The king, Ferdinand II, was forced to yield to the demand for a constitution.

Such was the condition of Italy at the opening of 1848. The demand for reform was universal, but now news arrived which caused Italians speedily to pass on from this to a far greater undertaking, the ending of foreign domination. The news was that the monarchy of Louis Philippe was overthrown; that the Second Republic was declared; that Germany had risen; that Austria was in the throes of dismemberment; that Metternich's system had collapsed, and that he himself had been driven into exile whither he had

Italy on the brink of revolution.

previously driven so many. The hour for Italy seemed to have struck in the hour of the distress of Austria. For the year 1848 was to be one of revolution the like of which Europe had not known since the Napoleonic period. Events were to succeed each other of a most sensational character, and the reaction of these events upon each other, of nation upon nation, of parts of nations upon other parts, was to be the most distinguishing as well as the most confusing characteristic of the time.

CHAPTER VIII

CENTRAL EUROPE IN REVOLT

The great mid-century uprising.

Central Europe at the opening of 1848 was then in a restless, disturbed, expectant state. Everywhere men were wearied with the old order and demanding change. A revolutionary spirit was at work, the public mind in Germany, Italy, and Austria was excited. Into a society so perturbed and so active came the news of the fall of Louis Philippe. It was the spark that set the world in conflagration. The news was received with joy by the discontented everywhere, who by it were themselves nerved to resistless energy. Revolution succeeded revolution in the various countries with startling rapidity. The whole political system of conservatism seemed about to founder utterly. The great mid-century uprising of the peoples had begun.

Vienna the storm-center.

The storm-center of this general convulsion proved to be Vienna, hitherto the proud bulwark of the established order. Here in the Austrian Empire one of the most confused chapters in European history began. A wild welter of disintegrating forces threatened for a while the very submersion of the Danubian state. The movement was so complicated and intricate that to give a clear account of it is exceedingly difficult. The immediate impulse came from Hungary. There the Diet had been in session since 1847, engaged in working out moderate reforms for the kingdom. The effect of the news of the fall of Louis Philippe was electrifying. The passion of the hour was expressed in a flaming speech by Kossuth, who proved himself a consummate spokesman for a people in revolt. Of impressive presence, and endowed with a wonderful voice, he was revolutionary oratory incarnate. In a speech in the Diet, March 3, 1848, he voiced

The decisive intervention of Hungary.

the feelings of the time, and seized the leadership from more moderate men. With bitter execration he fulminated against the Austrian Government as a charnel house whence issued suffocating vapors and pestilential winds benumbing the senses, deadening the national spirit. Only with a free constitution could the various races of Austria have a happy future and live together in brotherhood. The effect of this speech in Hungary and throughout the Austrian states was immediate and profound. Translated into German, and published in Vienna, it inflamed the passions of the people. Ten days later a riot broke out in Vienna itself, organized largely by students and workingmen. The soldiers fired and bloodshed resulted. Barricades were erected and the people and soldiers fought hand to hand. The crowd surged about and into the imperial palace, and invaded the hall in which the Diet was sitting, crying "Down with Metternich!" Metternich, who for thirty-nine years had stood at the head of the Austrian states, who was the very source and fount of reaction, imperturbable, pitiless, masterful, was now forced to resign, to flee in disguise from Austria to England, to witness his whole system crash completely beneath the onslaught of the very forces for which he had for a generation shown contempt.

The overthrow of Metternich.

The effect produced by the announcement of Metternich's fall was prodigious. It was the most astounding piece of news Europe had received since Waterloo. His fall was correctly heralded as the fall of a system hitherto impregnable.

As Hungary, under the spell of Kossuth's oratory, had exerted an influence upon Vienna, so now the actions of the Viennese reacted upon Hungary. The Hungarian Diet, dominated by the reform and national enthusiasm just unchained and constantly fanned by Kossuth, passed on March 15th and the days succeeding the famous March Laws, by which the process of reforming and modernizing Hungary, which had been going on for some years, was given the finish-

The March Laws.

ing touch. These celebrated laws represented the demands of the Hungarian national party led by Kossuth. They concerned two great subjects, the internal reorganization of Hungary and the future relations of that kingdom to the empire as a whole. They swept away the old aristocratic political machinery and substituted a modern democratic constitution. Henceforth there was to be a Diet meeting annually, not at Presburg, a town near Austria, but at Budapest, in the very heart of the kingdom, a Diet, moreover, to be elected, not by the privileged nobility but by every Hungarian owning property to the value of about one hundred and fifty dollars. The feudal services owed the nobility by the peasants were abolished, and nothing was said of compensation, save that it was a "debt of honor," presumably to be discharged by the nation later. Religious freedom, liberty of the press, trial by jury, a national guard were all proclaimed. And as regards the relations of Hungary to the empire, it was declared that Hungary should henceforth have its own ministry, not only for domestic business, but also for war, finance, and foreign affairs. These latter departments had hitherto belonged to the central government. The March laws made Hungary practically an independent nation. The only connection with Austria was in the person of the monarch, who could act in Hungary, however, only through this Hungarian ministry. The consent of the Vienna Government was all that was now needed to complete this virtual separation, and this consent was shortly given under the compulsion of dire necessity (March 31). Thus, with remarkable swiftness and without bloodshed, Hungary had practically won her independence. Henceforth she would be mistress of her own destinies. That she so understood the matter was shown by her creation of a national army with a national flag, and by the appointment of Hungarian ambassadors to foreign countries.

Hungary practically independent.

The example of Hungary was speedily followed by Bohemia. Here there were two races: the Germans, wealthy,

Revolution in Bohemia.

educated, but a minority, and the Czechs, poorer, but a majority, ambitious to make Bohemia a separate state, subject only to the emperor. The movement for the revival of Czechish nationality had been growing since 1830, expressed particularly by the revival of the Czechish language as a mark of distinction from the German, as a method of spiritual unification. This had been accompanied, as we have seen, by a revival of interest in Czechish and Slavic history. The Bohemians now sent a deputation to Vienna March 19th, to ask for the complete equality of Czechs and Germans, for the familiar liberal reforms relating to the Diet, the press, taxation, and religion, and for local autonomy. The Emperor a few days later conceded most of these demands.

Revolution in the Austrian provinces.

Meanwhile, recognizing the opportunity, the Liberals of Vienna and the Austrian provinces snatched at advantages for themselves. They demanded a constitution for the whole empire, and larger local self-government for the Austrian provinces. These demands, too, were granted, of course because of the helplessness of the Government. That helplessness was due chiefly to the critical situation in Italy. In Hungary, Bohemia, and the Austrian provinces extensive rights in the direction of self-government, of constitutional reform, of personal freedom, had been won. But there had in no case been a repudiation of the empire. The emperor's legitimate headship was not questioned. But in Italy it was just this that was denied. There, Austria possessed the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom. The leading city of Lombardy was Milan, of Venetia, Venice. These states had long resented Austrian rule. Moreover, the other states of Italy had, since 1815, been practically dominated by Austria. In the peninsula the desire to expel the foreigner completely, and to achieve unity, was strong and growing. This is an important chapter of Italian history, which, however, can only be briefly treated here. The Italian reformers saw their opportunity in the disturbances of 1848. Milan rose

Revolution in Lombardy-Venetia.

in insurrection, and expelled the Austrian troops, which were unprepared. Venice, under the inspiring leadership of Daniel Manin, threw off the Austrian allegiance and declared itself a republic once more. Piedmont, an independent state, threw in its lot with these rebels, and sent its army into Lombardy. The other Italian states, Tuscany, the Papacy, and Naples, being compelled thereto by the popular demand, sent troops forward to northern Italy to co-operate. The moment seemed to have arrived for the liberation of the peninsula from Austrian control. The peoples and governments appeared to be unanimous in their determination to drive out the Austrians once for all. Italy had practically declared its independence. Here, then, was the critical point that must be defended at all costs. Fortunately for Austria she had in northern Italy a commander equal to the task, Radetzky, a man who had served with credit in every Austrian war for sixty years, and who now at the age of eighty-two was to increase his reputation. Radetzky, forced out of Milan, retired to the famous Quadrilateral, the fortresses on the Adige and the Mincio, Legnago, Peschiera, Verona and Mantua, one of the strongest military positions in Europe. Temporarily on the defensive, he believed he could win in the end if properly supported. He succeeded in convincing the Austrian Government that the crucial point was Italy, that here the fate of the empire would be decided.

Italy renounces Austrian control.

Meanwhile, there were March days in Germany, too. Austria's distress was Germany's opportunity as it was Italy's. As we have seen, the personality and system of Metternich had imposed themselves upon the German Confederation, and through it upon the states of which it was composed. The news of his fall had immediate and resounding effect, and particularly in Prussia, for months kept fevered by its struggle with Frederick William IV for a real parliament. On March 15th barricades were erected in Berlin and for a week the capital was the scene of great turbulence and some

Revolution in Germany.

bloodshed. The King, who had begun to waver even before the outbreak, issued on the 18th a proclamation in which he summoned the United Landtag to co-operate in framing a constitution for the realm, guaranteeing the political and civil liberties that had been demanded for years. He also promised to lead in the attempt to achieve unity for Germany.

The national movement.

For the moment seemed to have come when this, also, might be wrung out of the chaos of the times, when the loose confederation erected by the Congress of Vienna might be transformed into a strong and vigorous union. The Liberals had always desired this, and had recently become unusually active in outlining plans and preparing for the future. The revolution in France gave them encouragement. The fact that Austria, interested in the preservation of the old Confederation, was now impotent, that the princes everywhere in Germany were powerless to oppose, greatly advanced the cause. A self-constituted committee of Liberals met at Heidelberg early in March and decided to call a preliminary assembly to consider the whole question. This preliminary assembly, or *Vorparlament*, met from March 31st to April 4th and arranged for the election, directly by the people, of an assembly that should draw up the constitution for a united Germany. The princes of the different states were forced to sanction this proceeding, as was also the Diet. In April and May the elections were held, and on May 18th the first German National Assembly or Parliament of Frankfort met amid the high hopes of the people.

The Parliament of Frankfort.

Thus by the end of March 1848 revolution, universal in its range, was everywhere successful. The famous March Days had demolished the system of government that had held sway in Europe for a generation. Throughout the Austrian Empire, in Germany and in Italy the revolution was triumphant. Hungary and Bohemia had obtained sweeping concessions; a constitution had been promised the Austrian provinces; several Italian states had obtained constitutions; the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom had declared itself inde-

The March revolutions everywhere triumphant.

pendent of Austria, and the rest of Italy was moving to support the rebels; a constitution had been promised Prussia, and a convention was about to meet to give liberty and unity to Germany.

Austria begins the work of restoration.

But the period of triumph was brief. At the moment of greatest humiliation Austria began to show remarkable powers of recovery. In the rivalries of her races, and in her army lay her salvation. The Government won its first victory, not in Italy, which was the critical point, but in Bohemia. There, in March, the Germans and the Czechs had worked together for the acquisition of the reforms described above. But shortly serious differences drove the two races apart. The Germans wished to have Bohemia represented in the Frankfort Parliament, and included within the new Germany that was expected to issue from the deliberations of that body. To this the Czechs, however, were strongly opposed, fearing that this would only mean the complete submersion of their own nationality in that of Germany, the Germans being overwhelmingly predominant. What they aspired to was ultimately a Czechish or Slavic kingdom of their own. Fearing this very thing the Germans in Bohemia redoubled their efforts to make the connection between Bohemia and Germany close. Racial animosities were thus vigorously fanned. The result was street disturbances in Prague between the Germans and Czechs, culminating in an insurrection June 12th. Windischgrätz, commander of the troops in Prague, proclaimed the city in a state of siege. Unable to restore quiet by negotiation he bombarded the city on the 17th, soon subdued it and was dictator. The army had won its first victory, and that, too, by taking advantage of the bitter racial antagonisms in which the Austrian Empire so abounded.

Bohemia conquered.

Italy partially conquered.

In Italy also the army was victorious. Radetzky had correctly foreseen the future. The Italians, after the first flush of enthusiasm, began to be torn by jealousies and dissensions. The Papal, Neapolitan, and Tuscan troops were

recalled and northern Italy was left to itself. The rulers of those states had sent their armies forward to join Piedmont in the war with Austria, not because they had wished to, but because of popular pressure which they now felt able to defy. Charles Albert was no match for Radetzky, and was defeated badly at Custozza, July 25th. Austria recovered Lombardy and could even have invaded Piedmont had it not been for the opposition of France and Great Britain. Hostilities were brought to a close by an armistice August 9th. By the middle of the summer of 1848 the Austrian Government was again in the saddle in Bohemia, and had partially recovered its power in Italy. But in Vienna itself and in Hungary its position was still most precarious.

Hungary, as we have seen, had won by the March Laws of 1848 a position of practical independence of Austria. It possessed its own ministry, which constituted the real government. The rôle of the Emperor was most circumscribed, yet he was forced to endure this humiliation for the present. But the Austrian ministry was only biding its time to humble this arrogant Magyar Government. The opportunity came with the outbreak of civil dissension within Hungary itself. There racial and national rivalries rose to the highest pitch. The Magyars, though a minority of the whole people, had always been dominant and the victory of March had been their victory. But the national feeling was strong and growing with Serbs, Croatians, and Roumanians. These, in the summer of 1848, demanded of the Hungarian Diet much the same privileges which the Magyars had won for themselves from the Vienna Government. They wished local self-government and the recognition of their own languages and peculiar customs. To this the Magyars would not for a moment consent. They intended that there should be but one nationality in Hungary—that of the Magyars. Individual civil equality should be guaranteed to all the inhabitants of the kingdom of whatever race, but no separate or partly separate nations, and no other

Civil dissension within Hungary.

official language than their own. They, therefore, refused these demands point-blank. As a consequence, the bitterest race hatreds broke out in this Hungarian state, whose power had been so recently established, and was so lightly grounded. The Magyars insisted that the Magyar language should be taught in all the schools in Croatia and should be used in all official communications between that province and the central government in Budapest. The Croatians resented this uncompromising and ungenerous policy and their resentment rapidly became rebellion. The Austrian Government appointed Jellachich, a Croatian colonel and a bitter opponent of the Magyars, as governor or ban of Croatia. This the Hungarians felt to be an insult, and their relations with the Vienna Government became very much strained. Jellachich labored from the outset to fan the flames of this hatred of Croat and Magyar. Would the Austrian Government sanction these acts of one of its subjects against Hungary? That Government had approved the March Laws which gave large powers to Hungary, and Hungary included Croatia, Slavonia, and other Slavic areas. The Hungarian Government was entirely within its rights when it demanded that Jellachich be dismissed and that the agreement of March be loyally applied. But Austria had made those concessions only from compulsion. It saw now in Jellachich a means of recalling them. But its own position was still too insecure to permit it to proceed openly and aboveboard to that direct end. The policy that it followed was most tortuous,—now apparently conceding the Hungarian demands, at the same time not discrediting Jellachich. It would be impossible in our space to trace these manœuvers in detail. Suffice it to say that conduct so uncandid increased daily the tension between Hungary and Austria, considered by Hungary responsible for the actions of Jellachich. A change consequently occurred in the inner politics of Hungary, which was resolved to maintain itself against the rebellious Slavs and, if Austria supported them, against

The Croatians rise against the Magyars.

Austria exploits the situation.

Austria itself. The Hungarian ministry since March had been a moderate one, in favor of maintaining peace. It included all the more important Magyar statesmen. But the perilous position into which the Magyars were drifting naturally favored the more warlike and revolutionary leaders who embodied the passionate hatred of the Slavs and Austrians. Peaceful negotiation between the various parties to the conflict failed, and in September 1848 matters were precipitated by Jellachich, who began a civil war by leading an army of Croatians and Serbs against the Magyars. The effect of this action was to arouse the Magyars to a fever heat, and to play directly into the hands of the aggressive war party. Kossuth and the extreme radicals now came into power. Those who stood for peaceful relations with Austria, like Deák, gave up in despair. The Austrian Government finally assumed the aggressive. On October 3d the Emperor declared the Hungarian Diet dissolved. At the same time Jellachich, so odious to all Magyars, was given the command of all the imperial troops in Hungary. The immediate effect, however, of this action was not what had been intended, but was rather another outbreak in Vienna itself. There the revolutionists, sympathizing with the Magyars, rose and actually controlled the city for several weeks. The Emperor fled to Olmütz. But now the army appeared upon the scene. Windischgrätz, recalled from Prague, besieged Vienna for five days, finally forcing its surrender October 31, 1848. Austria had won her third victory; for in Bohemia, in Italy, and now in Vienna the army had intervened with decisive effect and had either crushed or checked the revolutionary parties, and had won back for the Government some of the ground lost in March.

Radical party in Hungary seizes control.

The reactionary party in Austria now became stronger and more determined to finish with this ubiquitous revolution. It forced the Emperor Ferdinand to abdicate. He was succeeded December 2, 1848, by his nephew, Francis Joseph I, a lad of eighteen, who is still the Emperor of Austria (1909).

The purpose of this manœuver was to permit by a show of legality the abrogation of the March Laws in Hungary. Promises made by Ferdinand, it was held, were not binding upon his successor, and the promises of March were henceforth to be repudiated. Schwarzenberg, one of the most reckless, daring, and autocratic ministers of the nineteenth century, now became the real leader of the Government. The Austrian ministry, at last confident of its power, retracted the March Laws and prepared to subdue Hungary as it had subdued Bohemia and Vienna. Hungary stiffened for the coming conflict. She declared Francis Joseph a usurper. Only that person was King of Hungary who had been crowned in Hungary with the crown of St. Stephen. She therefore refused to recognize the new ruler until he should be crowned and take the oath to the constitution, and she held that Ferdinand was still King, and prepared to fight in his defense and that of the March Laws which he had sanctioned.

Abdication of the Emperor of Austria. Accession of Francis Joseph I.

Hungary declares Francis Joseph a usurper.

Thus it came about that the year 1849 saw a great war in Hungary. Austrian armies were sent into that country from various directions. The ungenerous conduct of the Magyars toward the other races in Hungary was now given its reward. Not only did the Hungarian armies have to face Austrian troops, flushed with victory, but in the south the Serbs were in full revolt, in the east the Roumanian peasantry favored the Austrians, in the south and southwest the Croatians and Slavonians under Jellachich were eager for revenge. The result was that the Hungarian armies in the period from January to March 1849 were in the main unsuccessful. In April, however, they gained several victories and drove back the Austrians. Then, in a frenzy of excitement, the Hungarian radicals, led by Kossuth, induced the Diet to take the momentous step of declaring that the House of Hapsburg, as false and perjured, had ceased to rule, and that Hungary was an independent nation. Kossuth was appointed President of the indivisible state of Hun-

War between Austria and Hungary.

Hungarian Declaration of Independence, April 14, 1849.

gary. While the word republic was not uttered, such would probably be the future form of government if the Hungarians succeeded in achieving their independence. The Hungarian victories still continued for a while, but the action of the Diet in declaring independence altered the situation disastrously. The matter became international. Foreign intervention brought this turbulent chapter abruptly to a close. The young Francis Joseph I made an appeal for aid to the Tsar of Russia. Nicholas I showed the greatest alacrity in responding. The reasons that determined him were various. He was both by temperament and conviction predisposed to aid his fellow-sovereigns against revolutionary movements if asked. He was an autocrat and interested in the preservation of autocracy wherever it existed. Also he had no desire to see a great republic on his very borders. Furthermore, a successful Hungary might make a restless Poland. Many Poles were fighting in the Hungarian armies.

Hungary conquered.

Russian troops, variously estimated at from 100,000 to 200,000, now poured into Hungary from the east and north. The Austrians again advanced from the west. The Hungarians fought brilliantly and recklessly, urged on by the eloquence of Kossuth. They sought the aid of the Turks but did not receive it. They even appealed to the Slavs, promising them in adversity the rights they had refused in prosperity, but in vain. The overwhelming numbers of their opponents rendered the struggle hopeless. Kossuth resigned in favor of Görgei, a leading general. The latter was forced to capitulate at Világos, August 13, 1849. The war of Hungarian Independence was over. Kossuth and others fled to Turkey, where they were given refuge. Nicholas proudly handed over to Francis Joseph his troublesome Hungary, which Austria, if left to her own resources, would probably have been unable to conquer. The punishment meted out to the Hungarians had no quality of mercy in it. Many generals and civilians were hanged. The constitutional privileges were entirely abolished. Hungary became a mere

province of Austria, and was crushed beneath the iron heel. The catastrophe of 1849 seemed the complete annihilation of that country.

The conquest of Italy completed.

Meanwhile Italy also had been reconquered by the revived military power of Austria. The armistice concluded in August 1848 between Austria and Piedmont, after the battle of Custozza, lasted seven months, during which time diplomacy was vainly attempting to effect a peace. Austria crushed Lombardy as never before beneath a harsh military rule. Charles Albert considered himself now so deeply pledged to deliver Italy that he resolved to reopen the war and did so in the spring of 1849. But his chances were much poorer than in 1848. During those months absolutism in its severest form had been restored in Naples, and Naples consequently would send no aid; also the Pope had fled from Rome, his prime minister, Rossi, having been murdered, and had gone to Naples as the guest of Ferdinand. Rome had been declared a republic, with Mazzini as one of the Triumvirs, as the executive was called. Tuscany, also, had been declared a republic, the Grand Duke having likewise taken refuge with Ferdinand of Naples. Tuscany and Rome were consequently involved in such internal complications that they could not be counted on in a renewal of the war. Moreover, there was little sympathy between the republicans of these states and the monarchists of Piedmont, for one of the causes here, as everywhere, of Austrian success lay in the fact that the revolutionists were divided among themselves. When Charles Albert took the field, therefore, in 1849 he took it alone. No help came from the states to the south. The result was not long doubtful. At Novara, March 23, 1849, the Sardinian army was utterly overthrown. The King himself sought death on the battlefield, but in vain. "Even death has cast me off," he said. Believing that better terms could be made for his country if another sovereign were on the throne, he abdicated in favor of his son, Victor Emmanuel II, whose reign, begun in the darkest

Abdication of Charles Albert.

adversity, was destined to be glorious. Passing into exile, Charles Albert died a few months later. He had rendered, however, a great service to his house and to Italy, for he had shown that there was one Italian prince who was willing to risk everything for the national cause. He had enlisted the interest and the faith of the Italians in the Government of Piedmont, in the House of Savoy. He was looked upon as a martyr to the national cause.

Overthrow of the Roman Republic.

The battle of Novara was followed shortly by the overthrow of the Florentine Republic and the restoration of the grand duke of Tuscany. But the restoration of the Pope and the extinction of the Roman Republic was a more difficult task. That republic, under the leadership of Mazzini, was becoming popular with the former subjects of the Pope, and would no doubt have lived had foreign powers been willing to let it alone. But they were not. France, believing that Austria would intervene if she did not, and wishing to assert something like a balance of power in the peninsula, decided to send an expedition to restore the Pope, but at the same time to preserve the free institutions that had recently been won by the Romans. The president of the republic, Louis Bonaparte, favored this for personal reasons. He wished to win the favor of the Catholics and conservatives of France. And thus France, pledged by its very constitution "never to employ its forces against the liberties of another people," went to work to destroy a sister republic. It should be said that the true Republicans in France strove to prevent the Government from embarking upon this policy, but in vain. At first the French were repulsed, but then, reinforced and far superior to the Romans, they began a siege of the city which lasted about three weeks, ending in its capture June 30, 1849.

Fall of Venice.

With the fall of Venice before the Austrians in August 1849 this chapter of Italian history closes. The hopes of 1848 had withered fast. A cruel reaction now held sway throughout most of the peninsula. The power of Austria

was restored, greater apparently than ever. Piedmont alone preserved a real independence, but Piedmont was for the time being crushed beneath the burdens of a disastrous war and a humiliating peace.

The Parliament of Frankfort.

Meanwhile the victories of the Liberals in Germany were being succeeded by defeats. There hope had centered in the deliberations of the Parliament of Frankfort, consisting of nearly six hundred representatives, elected by universal suffrage. The assembly was composed of many able men, but it possessed only a moral authority. Though its existence had not been prevented by the rulers of the various states, because they had not dared to oppose what the people so plainly desired, still those rulers gave it no positive support and played a waiting game, hoping to be able to prevent the execution of any decisions unfavorable to themselves. The assembly aspired to give unity and a constitution to Germany. But having no draft ready to discuss, much time was lost. Debates on rather abstract questions, too, which might better have been postponed, consumed many weeks, during which the old order was beginning to win back its old position, particularly in Austria. Gradually, however, the Constitution was elaborated. It reduced considerably the powers of the several rulers and created a fairly strong federal state. Two most thorny questions long baffled the assembly: what territory should be included in the new Germany, and who should be its head? The difficulties were extreme in either case. They lay in the fact that there were two great powers, Austria and Prussia, the fundamental fact, as we have seen, of the historical evolution of Germany. Any decision of either question would probably offend one or the other. Austria was the chief problem. Should she be admitted into the new union? If so, wholly or only in part? If wholly, that would mean that millions of Italians, Croatians, Hungarians, Poles, Roumanians would come in, would participate in the making of the laws. It would mean, too, that the new central par-

The Gordian knot.

liament would have to legislate for a most motley aggregation of peoples. Moreover, the empire thus created would be no *Germany*, but a nondescript. Austria, largely non-German, had a population of 38,000,000. The rest of Germany would number only about 32,000,000. Austria would, therefore, have an absolute majority in the parliament, and the actions of that majority might be determined by the desires of Hungarians and Slavs. Obviously such an unity would be a mockery. Moreover, to permit such dissimilar elements to live together the loosest confederation would be necessary, and Germans were tired of loose confederations. On the other hand, to admit only the German provinces of Austria would be to break up the unity of Austria, and to this the Austrian Government objected. It was finally decided, however, to include those provinces only. The boundaries of the new union were to be the same as those of the German Confederation.

The other most important question was what should be the form of the new government, and who should be the executive? Should there be an emperor or a president or a board, and, if an emperor, should his office be hereditary, or for life, or for a term of years? Should he be the ruler of Prussia or of Austria, or should first one and then the other rule? The final decision was that Germany should be an hereditary empire, and on March 28, 1849, the King of Prussia was chosen to be its head. Austria announced curtly that it "would neither let itself be expelled from the German Confederation, nor let its German provinces be separated from the indivisible monarchy."

Leadership in Germany offered to the King of Prussia.

The center of interest now shifted to Berlin, whither a delegation went to offer to Frederick William IV the imperial crown of a united Germany. Would he accept it? If he should, the new scheme to which twenty-eight minor states had already assented would go into force, though it might involve a war with Austria, by this time largely recovered from her various troubles. Frederick William had declared

in 1847 that he was willing to settle the German question, "with Austria, without Austria, yes, if need be, against Austria." Now, however, he was in a very different mood. He declined the offer of the Frankfort Parliament. The reasons were varied. Austria protested that she would never accept a subordinate position, and this protest alarmed him. And he disliked the idea of receiving a crown from a revolutionary assembly; rather, in his opinion, ought such a gift to come from his equals, the princes of Germany.

Rejection of the work of the Frankfort Parliament.

Thus the two great German powers, Austria and Prussia, rejected the work of the Frankfort Parliament. Rebuffed in such high quarters, that body was unable to impose its work upon Germany, and it finally ended its existence wretchedly. In session for over a year it accomplished nothing. But the responsibility for the failure of Germans to achieve a real unity in 1848 and 1849 rests primarily not with it, but with Prussia and Austria. Its failure, however, and its mistakes probably made it easier for the next generation to solve the problem.

The "humiliation of Olmütz."

The King of Prussia now attempted to form a union along his own royal lines. This brought him into conflict, however, with Austria in 1850, which peremptorily ordered him to abandon his schemes, which he forthwith did. This was the famous "humiliation of Olmütz." Austria then demanded that the old German Confederation of 1815, which had been suspended in 1848, be revived with its Diet at Frankfort. This was done in 1851.

Results of the revolutions of 1848.

The permanent results of this mid-century uprising of central Europe were very slight. Everywhere the old governments slipped back into the old grooves and resumed the old traditions. Two states, however, emerged with constitutions which they kept, Sardinia, whose Constitutional Statute granted by Charles Albert on March 4, 1848, established a real constitutional and parliamentary government, the only one in Italy, and Prussia, whose Constitution issued by the King in its final form in 1850 was far less liberal, yet

sufficed to range Prussia among the constitutional states of Europe. By it the old absolutism of the state was changed, at least in form. There was henceforth a parliament consisting of two chambers. In one respect this document was a bitter disappointment to all Liberals. In the March days of 1848 the King had promised universal suffrage, but the Constitution as finally promulgated rendered it illusory. It established a system unique in the world. Universal suffrage was not withdrawn, but was marvelously manipulated. The voters were divided in each electoral district throughout Prussia into three classes, according to wealth. The amount of taxes paid by the district was divided into three equal parts. Those voters who paid the first third were grouped into one class, those, more numerous, who paid the second third into another class, those who paid the remainder into still another class. The result was that a few very rich men were set apart by themselves, the less rich by themselves, and the poor by themselves. Each of these three groups, voting separately, elected an equal number of delegates to a convention, which convention chose the delegates of that constituency to the lower house of the Prussian Parliament. Thus in every electoral assembly two-thirds of the members belonged to the wealthy class. There was no chance in such a system for the poor, for the masses. This system, established by the Constitution of 1850, still exists in Prussia. It gives an enormous preponderance of political power to the rich. The first class consists of very few men, in some districts of only one; the second class is sometimes twenty times as numerous; the third sometimes a hundred, or even a thousand times. Thus though every man twenty-five years of age has the suffrage, the vote of a single rich man may have as great weight as the votes of a thousand workingmen.

CHAPTER IX

THE SECOND REPUBLIC AND THE FOUNDING OF THE SECOND EMPIRE

THE SECOND REPUBLIC

The French Revolution of 1848.

The Revolution of 1848 in France was extraordinarily swift, entirely unexpected, and extremely radical. "Though the February Revolution," says de Tocqueville, "was of all our revolutions the shortest and the least sanguinary, yet far more than any other it filled the minds and hearts of men with the idea and feeling of its omnipotence." Beginning as a moderate demand for a larger electorate, it soon passed far beyond this into the realm of the new and the uncertain. A revolution of three days, it was made without premeditation, without definite plan or accredited leaders. The day of the 24th of February was made memorable by events crowding upon each other with irresistible pressure. On the morning of that day there was no public demand for a republic; by sunset a republic, the second in the history of France, had been proclaimed. This spectacular outcome was the one least imagined, as it had seemed for the past few years that the republican party which had so troubled Louis Philippe's early years as king was now moribund. Suddenly under the pressure of circumstances it awoke, and, though the party of a small Parisian minority, it won the triumphs of the day and established its régime.

Stages in the history of the Second Republic.

The Second Republic lasted nominally nearly five years, from February 24, 1848, to December 2, 1852, when the Second Empire was proclaimed. Practically, however, as we shall see, it came to an end one year earlier, December 2, 1851. During this period the state was administered

successively by the Provisional Government, chosen on February 24th, and remaining in power for about ten weeks, then for about a year by the National Constituent Assembly, which framed the Constitution of the Republic, and then by the President and Legislative Assembly, created by this constitution. The history of the Republic was to be a very troubled one.

Two elements in the Provisional Government.

The Provisional Government was from the first composed of two elements. The larger number, led by Lamartine, were simply Republicans, desirous of a republican form of government in place of the monarchical. "I regard the republican government," says Lamartine, "that is to say, the government of peoples by their own reason and their own will, as the sole aim and the sole end of the great civilizations, as the sole means of realizing the great general truths that a people desires to inaugurate in its laws. Other forms of government are states of tutelage, confessions of the eternal minority of peoples, imperfections in the sight of philosophy, humiliations in the sight of history."

The Republicans.

The Socialists.

The other element of the Provisional Government was represented by Louis Blanc, Flocon, Albest, men who believed in a republic, but as a means to an end, and that end a social, economic revolution; men who wished primarily to improve the condition of the laboring classes, to work out in actual laws and institutions the socialistic theories propounded with such effectiveness during the later years of the reign of Louis Philippe, and particularly the principles represented in Louis Blanc's famous phrase, "the right to labor." What these men most desired was not a mere political change, but a thoroughgoing reconstruction of society in the interest of the largest and weakest class, the poor, the wage-earners. Blanc's conception of the republic he thus expressed: "It has always been my opinion that the republican form of government is not the sole object to be aimed at, even by politicians of the republican school, if their love for the commonwealth be sincere and disinterested.

I believed then, as I do now, that the chief end to be kept in view is to make him that works enjoy the fruits of his work; to restore to the dignity of human nature those whom the excess of poverty degrades; to enlighten those whose intelligence, from want of education, is but a dim, vacillating lamp in the midst of darkness; in one word, to enfranchise the people, by endeavoring to abolish this double slavery, ignorance and misery." [1]

Louis Blanc's theories.

Blanc was a convinced Socialist, intelligent and thoughtful. The interests of the working classes constituted, in his opinion, the supreme problem of government. He wished to replace private property by public property in the interest of the greater number. He would do this by co-operative societies. Production should not be carried on by capitalists, employing laborers for wages and retaining profits for themselves. The laborers should manage the various industries themselves, reaping whatever rewards there were. To start these co-operative societies the aid of the state, furnishing capital, would be necessary. But in the end, gradually and without violence, the whole process of production would be transferred from the control of the few to that of the many.

A scheme so novel and so opposed to the habits and institutions of the ages was bound to be misconceived and misrepresented. Believers in the existing order would denounce every economic change as robbery; believers in change would be more dominated by passion, by hatred of the rich, by a desire for a division of property, than by moderate or equitable plans of economic reform.

Achievements of the Provisional Government.

The Provisional Government, divided as it was into Socialists and Anti-Socialists, ran the risk of all coalitions, that of being reduced to impotence by internal dissensions, as was to be immediately shown. Certain great reforms were, however, carried with practical unanimity. The death

[1] Quotations are from Dickinson, Revolution and Reaction in Modern France, pp. 176, 178.

penalty for political offenses was abolished. Universal suffrage was proclaimed, and thus political power passed suddenly from the hands of about two hundred thousand privileged wealthy persons to over nine million electors. Negro slavery throughout the French colonies was abolished, as it had been in the first French Revolution. The freedom of the press was established, as were the freedom of public meeting and association and the right of all citizens to become members of the National Guard. The results were almost instantaneous and completely changed the character of political life in Paris. Newspapers and party pamphlets, sold cheaply, appeared in profusion, expressing the most varied and in many cases most radical ideas, and influencing far greater numbers than the French press had previously done. Political clubs, similar to those of the Revolution, were opened and formed additional clearing-houses for opinion and debate, and the National Guard rose in a few weeks from 50,000 to about 200,000. In other words, the masses of Parisian workmen now had weapons in the hand, as members of the Guard, and means of self-expression and propaganda in clubs and newspapers.

The question of the flag.

Conflicts between the two great currents of opinion began on the very day of the proclamation of the Republic. Armed workmen came in immense numbers to the Hôtel de Ville and demanded that henceforth the banner of France should be the red flag, emblem of Socialism. Lamartine repelled this demand in a brilliant speech. "You desire," he said, "to replace a revolution marked by unanimity and fraternity with one of revenge and suffering. You demand that the Government raise as a sign of peace the standard of war to the bitter end among citizens of the same country. Never will I sign such a decree. I will repel to the last moment of my life this bloody flag, and you ought to reject it more than I, for the red flag has never been borne elsewhere than around the Champ-de-Mars, imbrued with the blood of the people in 1791 and 1793, while the tricolor has

made the circuit of the world with the name, the glory, and the liberty of France." Lamartine's eloquence was overwhelming. The workmen themselves stamped upon the red flag.

But the Government, achieving an oratorical victory, saw itself forced to yield to the socialist party in two important respects. On motion of Louis Blanc, it recognized the so-called "right to labor." It promised work to all citizens, and as a means to this end it established, against its own real wishes, the famous National Workshops. Blanc demanded that a Ministry of Progress be established, to organize co-operative associations of the kind which he had advocated. But, instead, the Government established a Labor Commission, with Blanc at its head and with its place of meeting the Luxembourg Palace. This was a mere debating society, a body to investigate economic questions and report to the Government. It had no power of action, or of putting its opinions into execution. Moreover, by removing Louis Blanc from the Hôtel de Ville to another part of Paris, the Government really reduced his influence and that of his party. Yet this Labor Commission, thus lamed at the start, set loyally to work. It was composed of delegates of workingmen representing different crafts, of political economists, and even of employers. Declaring that "manual labor too prolonged ruins the health of the laborer, and by preventing the cultivation of his mind, undermines the dignity of man," it demanded the reduction of the working day from eleven to ten hours in Paris, and from twelve to eleven throughout the country. The Provisional Government then decreed this change, but the decree remained a dead letter, as employers ignored it. The Commission persuaded the Government to abolish the "sweating" system. It also acted as a court of arbitration in certain labor disputes with some measure of success. But as time wore on it became irritated over its general lack of achievement, which contrasted so lamentably with

The Labor Commission.

Its impotence.

the endless hopes it had aroused. The irritation constantly deepened, and the Commission became in the end a center of much inflammatory talk. Looked to for leadership by tens of thousands of workmen, it was a source of danger to the Government. Deprived of all modes of legal action, it might become the seat of conspiracies and illegal proceedings.

The National Workshops.

The National Workshops, too, were a source of ultimate disappointment to those who had looked to them to solve the complex labor problems of the modern industrial system. Conceded by the Provisional Government against its will, and to gain time, that Government did not intend that they should succeed. Their creation was intrusted to the Minister of Commerce, Marie, a personal enemy of Louis Blanc, who, according to his own admission, was willing to make this experiment in order to render the latter unpopular and to show workingmen the fallacy of his theories of production, and the dangers of such theories for themselves. The scheme was represented as Louis Blanc's, though it was denounced by him, was established especially to discredit him, and was a veritable travesty of his ideas. Blanc wished to have every man practise his own trade in real factories, started by State aid. They should be engaged in productive enterprises; moreover, only men of good character should be permitted to join these associations. Instead of this, the Government simply set men of the most varied sorts—cobblers, carpenters, metal workers, masons, to labor upon unproductive tasks, such as making excavations for public works. They were organized in a military fashion, and the wages were uniform, two francs a day.

Their rapid growth.

It was properly no system of production that was being tried, but a system of relief for the unemployed, who were very numerous owing to the fact that many factories had had to close because of the general disturbed state of affairs. The number of men flocking to these National Workshops increased alarmingly: 25,000 in the middle of March; 66,000

in the middle of April; over 100,000 in May. As there was not work enough for all, the number of working days was reduced for each man to two a week, and his total wage for the week fixed at eight francs. The result was that large numbers of men were kept idle most of the time, were given wretched wages, and had plenty of time to discuss their grievances. They furnished excellent material for socialist agitators. This experiment wasted the public money, accomplished nothing useful, and led to a street war of the most appalling kind.

The National Constituent Assembly.

The Provisional Government was, as the name signified, only a temporary organization whose duty was to administer the state until an assembly should be elected by the new universal suffrage, which assembly should then frame a Constitution. The elections were held April 23d, and the National Constituent Assembly met on May 4, 1848. The assembly consisted of nine hundred men, about eight hundred of them moderate Republicans. The Socialists had almost disappeared.

The Assembly hostile to the Socialists.

The Assembly showed at once that it was bitterly opposed to the opinions of the Socialists of Paris. The Provisional Government now laid down its powers, and the Assembly chose five of its members, all Anti-Socialists, with Lamartine as the head, as the new executive until the Constitution should be drawn up. All these men had been opposed to Louis Blanc. The Assembly also refused to create the Ministry of Labor demanded by the latter. The workingmen of Paris, irritated at this refusal and at the outcome of the elections, and seeing that they had nothing to hope for from this Assembly, rose in insurrection, endeavoring to accomplish a new revolution which should bring in the socialistic state as that of February had brought in the republican democratic. On May 15th they invaded the Chamber, drove out the representatives, and declared the Assembly dissolved and proclaimed a new Provisional Government of their own. But their victory was short-lived. The National Guard

...ne to the rescue of the Assembly, and some of the leaders of the insurgents were made prisoners.

Abolition of the National Workshops.

The Assembly, irritated in turn by the humiliation to which it had been subjected, resolved to root out the great source of danger, the National Workshops. The Government announced their immediate abolition, giving the workmen the alternative of enrolling in the army or going into the country to labor on public works. If they did not leave voluntarily, they would be forced to leave. The laborers, goaded to desperation, prepared to resist and to overthrow this Government which they had helped bring into existence, and which had proved so unsympathetic. Organized as a semi-military force, angered at the hostility of the bourgeois to all helpful social reform that could make their lives easier, they began a bitter fight. The Assembly saw the terrible nature of the conflict impending. General Cavaignac was given dictatorial powers by the Assembly, the executive commission of five resigning. During four June days (June 23-26, 1848) the most fearful street fighting Paris had ever known went on behind a baffling network of barricades. The issue was long doubtful, but finally the insurgents were put down. The cost was terrible. Ten thousand were killed or wounded. Eleven thousand prisoners were taken, and their deportation was immediately decreed by the Assembly. The June Days left among the poor an enduring legacy of hatred toward the bourgeoisie.

The June Days.

A military dictatorship.

The republic of order had definitely triumphed over the socialistic agitation. But so narrow had been its escape, so fearful was it with anxiety for the future that the dictatorship of Cavaignac was continued until the end of October. Thus the Second Republic, proclaimed in February 1848, after ten troubled weeks under a Provisional Government, passed under military leadership for the next four months. One-man power was rapidly emerging.

The results of this socialist agitation and of the sanguinary days of June were lamentable and far-reaching. They

greatly contributed to the overthrow of the Republic. Many of the bourgeois had during these months experienced the most acute financial distress. Many manufacturers and merchants were ruined by the economic crisis created by the disturbed state of affairs. Bonds depreciated in two months from 116 francs to 50, with the result that fortunes invested in these securities were suddenly cut in two. Their holders became enemies to the Republic, because they wished above everything a government of order, under which alone business could flourish and property be secure. This class was very influential.

Growing opposition to the Republic.

The peasants also turned against the Republic. They were told that the Socialists were going to take their lands from them and divide them. They were as strongly attached to the principle of private property as were the rich, and for the same reason desired a government of order. But more important, because alienating the peasants from the Republic, was the action of the Provisional Government in levying a new tax.

The financial situation of France at the close of the July Monarchy was unsatisfactory, and was rendered worse by the Revolution, which caused widespread business uncertainty, undermined credit, and made the collection of taxes difficult. Bankruptcy was not to be thought of, as the Government did not wish to have the Second Republic mean, in the opinion of mankind, the repudiation of debts, as had the First. On the other hand, no new loan could be raised. The Government, therefore, did the only thing it could do; it increased the direct taxes by almost one-half (forty-five centimes supplementary to each franc hitherto paid). This fell not only upon the middle class, but also upon the peasants. Nothing could have been more disastrous for the Republic, which thus lost its popularity with the most numerous class. If the Republic meant increased taxes, it was, in their opinion, inferior to monarchy. The effect of this tax was shown more clearly later. It had had but a small

An unpopular financial measure.

influence upon the elections for the Constituent Assembly, not being widely known.

The framing of the Constitution.

After the suppression of the Socialists in June the Assembly proceeded to frame the Constitution, for which task it had been chosen. It proclaimed the Republic as the definitive government of France. It declared universal suffrage. It provided that there should be a legislature consisting of a single chamber. A second chamber seemed aristocratic, and, moreover, likely to be a check upon the first, that is, upon the people seeking to legislate, and therefore was rejected. The Assembly was to consist of 750 members, chosen for three years, to be renewed in full at the end of that period.

The powers of the executive.

The executive was to be a President of the Republic elected for four years and ineligible for re-election save after a four years' interval. He was given very considerable powers. It was felt that the danger in giving him these would be neutralized by the shortness of his term and by his inability to be immediately re-elected. He was given the right to propose legislation to the Assembly, to "dispose of the armed force," to negotiate and ratify treaties, though these should become binding only when sanctioned by the Assembly, to appoint and dismiss ministers and other officials, civil and military. The President therefore was to be a person of power. How he should be chosen was the most important question before the Constituent Assembly, and was long debated. The Assembly, dominated by its fundamental dogma of universal suffrage and popular sovereignty, was disposed to have the President chosen by all the voters. The danger in this procedure lay in the lack of political experience of the French electorate, and the probability that they would be blinded by some distinguished or famous name in making their choice, not guided by an intelligent analysis of character and of fitness for the high office. Moreover, if the people should choose both the legislature and the President, they would create two co-ordinate authorities, likely to dis-

Discussion concerning the presidency.

agree, and in that case with the chance of victory resting with the President, a single individual, knowing his own mind, acting directly and swiftly, rather than with the legislature divided into parties, and necessarily acting slowly. This likelihood that the President, wielding the military and civil power, might overturn the Republic and make himself a despot, was distinctly foreseen by some members, who explicitly warned the Assembly against it, notably by Jules Grévy, later a President of the Third Republic, who urged that the President be chosen by the legislature and that he be removable at any time by it. Thus Parliament would be the supreme body in the state, not simply a co-ordinate and rival power, and presidential usurpations would be impossible. "Are you quite sure," said Grévy, "that in that series of men who are to succeed each other every four years to the presidential throne, there will be only devoted republicans anxious to descend from it? Are you sure that there will never be any one sufficiently ambitious to try to perpetuate his power? . . . And if this man is a member of one of those families which have ruled over France, if he has never expressly renounced what he calls his rights, if commerce is languishing, if the people are suffering, if they are passing through one of those crises in which misery and deception deliver them over to those who conceal by promises their projects against liberty; will you guarantee that this man of ambition will not succeed in overthrowing the Republic?" Events were shortly to prove Grévy's clear right to the title of prophet, but his proposition was now voted down overwhelmingly. "Something must be left to Providence," answered Lamartine. Another amendment was suggested that at least no member of any of the families which had ruled France should ever be chosen President. This, too, for doctrinaire reasons, and because it seemed to limit the national sovereignty, was voted down, and it was definitely decided that the people should choose the President and should be entirely

The President to be chosen by universal suffrage.

The voters to be untrammeled in their choice.

untrammeled in their choice. Thus in the very act of drawing up a Constitution for the Second Republic, the Assembly rendered easy, if not inevitable, its overthrow.

Though the Republicans of 1848 committed many grave errors, owing partially to their inexperience, partially to their indisposition to abate any of their traditional political principles in the face of the extraordinary exigencies of a tumultuous and turbulent year, yet their work had certain consequences destined to survive. For fifty years the Republic had been associated in the minds of multitudes of Frenchmen with the Reign of Terror, had signified violence, disorder, and confiscation of property. It now became evident that it might mean something very different, for here was a Republic which suppressed insurrection and restored order with a resolution and thoroughness that the monarchy had not shown under Charles X or Louis Philippe, one, moreover, which preferred unpopularity to bankruptcy. The June Days and the tax of the forty-five centimes were direct causes of its downfall. Yet by them the Republic as an ideal of government ultimately gained strength, though the present experiment proved ephemeral and weak.

Louis Napoleon Bonaparte's opportunity.

For, in leaving the choice of the President to universal suffrage, this republican assembly was playing directly into the hands of a pretender to a throne, of a man who believed he had the right to rule France by reason of his birth, Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, nephew of the Great Napoleon and legitimate heir to his pretensions. At the time of the February Revolution this man was practically without influence or significance, but so swiftly did events move and opinion shift in that year 1848 that by the time the mode of choosing the President was decided upon, he was already known to be a leading candidate, a fact that stamped that decision as all the more foolhardy.

Louis Napoleon Bonaparte had become chief of the house of Bonaparte in 1832 at the age of twenty-four. He con-

ceived his position with utmost seriousness. He believed that he had a right to rule over France, and that the day would come when he would. He adhered to this belief for sixteen years, though those years brought him no practical encouragement, but only the reverse. Gathering about him a few adventurers, he attempted in 1836, at Strasburg, and in 1840 at Boulogne, to seize power. Both attempts, already described, were puerile in their conception, and were bunglingly executed. Both ended in fiasco. He had gained the name of being ridiculous, a thing exceedingly difficult for Frenchmen to forgive or forget. As a result of the former attempt he had been exiled to the United States, from which he shortly returned. As a result of the latter he was imprisoned in the fortress of Ham in northern France, from which he escaped in 1846, disguised as an ordinary mason, named Badinguet. He then went to England and in 1848, at the time of the Chartist risings, he was a special constable stationed in Trafalgar Square. This was certainly no record of achievement. But the stars in their courses were fighting for him. The Revolution of 1848 created his opportunity, as that of 1789 had created that of the First Napoleon. Like his great prototype, whom he constantly sought to imitate, he offered his services to the Republic. He was elected a member of the Constituent Assembly, where the impression he created was that of a mediocre man, with few ideas of his own, who could probably be controlled by others. His name, however, was a name to conjure with. This was his only capital, but it was sufficient. The word Napoleon was seen to be a marvelous vote-winner with the peasants, who, now that universal suffrage was the law of the land, formed the great majority. "How should I not vote for this gentleman," said a peasant to Montalembert, "I whose nose was frozen at Moscow?" Louis Napoleon was an avowed candidate for the presidency, and, as the most colorless, was the strongest. Cavaignac was the candidate of the democratic Re-

His previous career.

A member of the Constituent Assembly.

A candidate for the presidency.

publicans, who had governed France since February, but he was not popular, and, moreover, he was hated by the workingmen for his part in the June Days. Ledru-Rollin was the candidate of the Socialists, an aggressive party, but made odious to law-abiding citizens by the events of the year, and always in the great minority. Lamartine was also a candidate. His sun had mounted swiftly to full meridian splendor in February, but was as swiftly paling. Moreover, the parties opposed to the very idea of a republic now rallied about Louis Napoleon—the Legitimists and the Orleanists, as they preferred even an Empire to a Republic, an unknown man who seemed pliable to a man known for firmness, rigidity, and strenuous republicanism, as was Cavaignac. Moreover, the enigmatic candidate was most profuse in pleasing promises to various groups. There were other causes for Louis Napoleon's overwhelming triumph. The Republic had been proclaimed by a faction in Paris, and had never been formally approved by France. It was associated in the minds of men with grave uncertainty as to rights of property, rights to which the French have always held tenaciously. Louis Napoleon, by his professions and his family traditions, seemed to stand for order and stability. Again, for many years a series of brilliant writers had been portraying in history and in poetry the wonders of the Napoleonic era. Men's actual knowledge of the evils and oppressions of that era was growing less as the older generation, which could have told the true tale, was disappearing, and a new Napoleonic legend, fair, thrilling, and altogether admirable had grown up. It mattered little that this legend was vitiated through and through by mendacity and distortion of history.

Causes of his triumph

Louis Napoleon elected President Dec. 10, 1848.

For these reasons, when the presidential election of December 1848 occurred, Louis Napoleon was found to be overwhelmingly the elect of the people. He had over 5,400,000 votes, while Cavaignac, his nearest competitor, had less than 1,500,000, Ledru-Rollin 370,000, and Lamartine less

than 18,000. The new President entered upon his duties December 20, 1848. On that day before the Assembly he swore "to remain faithful to the democratic republic," and said: "My duty is clear. I will fulfil it as a man of honor. I shall regard as enemies of the country all those who endeavor to change by illegal means that which France has established."

The Legislative Assembly.

The French had thus selected a Prince as President, an innovation in the art of government. In the following May they did an equally astonishing thing in the election of a Legislative Assembly. This Assembly of 750 members contained about 500 Monarchists, who were divided into Legitimists, Orleanists, and a few Bonapartists; about 70 moderate Republicans of the kind that had thus far controlled the Republic, and about 180 Socialists. Thus the first legislature elected under the new Constitution of the Republic was overwhelmingly monarchical. Only 70 could be held to be sincerely attached to the present form of government. The explanation of this remarkable result lies in the fact that the Days of June were still very vivid in men's minds. The mass of Frenchmen voted for monarchical candidates because they believed that the Republic was dangerous to order and property.

President and Assembly opposed to the Constitution.

Thus both the President and the majority of the Assembly were, by reason of their very being, enemies of the Constitution under which they were elected. The situation was one that could not permanently endure. The three years that elapsed between the inauguration of the President and the coup d'état of 1851, which virtually ushered in the Empire, though it was not formally proclaimed until a year later, were a period not of legislative and social reform, but of adroit and tortuous factional politics, played not for the advancement of France, but for the advantage of party. Not particularly instructive, a brief treatment of them will suffice.

At first the President and the monarchical majority co-

They combine to crush the Republicans.

operated against the republican party, which each felt to be the real enemy. Opportunities for doing this were not slow in presenting themselves. Some of the Republicans unwisely attempted an insurrection against the Government, June 13, 1849. This was easily put down. Following up their victory, the authorities proceeded to cripple the Opposition severely. Thirty-three of their representatives were arrested and deprived of their seats in the Legislative Assembly. Their journals were suppressed. Public meetings were forbidden for a year, an order renewed several times later. As school-teachers had been effective friends of the Republic all over France, education was largely reorganized with a view of bringing it more closely under the control of the clergy, friends of monarchy. Paris was declared under martial law, which gave greater actual power than ever to the President.

The Franchise Law of 1850.

This removal of the republican leaders rendered easy the passage of further repressive legislation. The Assembly next enacted the Franchise Law of 1850. This provided that to be a voter one must have resided in a given commune for three years, and that that fact must be proved by the presence of one's name on the tax list. This law virtually abolished universal suffrage and re-established in a roundabout way a property qualification. It deprived over three million workingmen, one-third of the electorate, of the suffrage, either because they paid no taxes or because to get work they had frequently to change their residence and could not, therefore, meet the three-year residence qualification. Those thus disfranchised, of course, bitterly hated the Assembly. Another law was then passed restricting the freedom of the press by re-establishing the requirement of a preliminary deposit of 50,000 francs from all editors. This stamped out of existence most of the cheap newspapers of the Republicans and Socialists, as they could not meet the qualification.

Having silenced the Republicans, the victors, President

and Assembly, fell to warring with each other. This conflict, showing itself in many minor matters, became most pronounced and bitter over the question of a revision of the Constitution. The Constitution forbade the re-election of the President at the end of his four-year term. Louis Napoleon had no desire to retire to private life. He believed that if only this article were stricken out the immense majority of Frenchmen would re-elect him. He demanded that this clause be revised by the Assembly. The Assembly refused. The President was balked in his ambition of continuing in power by peaceful means. He now showed that he was ready to resort to any means to that end. He planned and carried out with extraordinary precision and success a remarkable coup d'état. In order to discredit the Assembly with the people, he demanded that the law limiting the suffrage, which he himself had strongly urged, be repealed. This was refused, the Assembly not wishing to stultify itself so conspicuously. The President, with audacious duplicity, then posed as the guardian of the Constitution, as the representative of the principle of universal suffrage. He believed that the workmen would not intervene in behalf of the Assembly if he should attack it.

President demands the revision of the Constitution.

For a successful coup d'état secrecy was the absolute prerequisite, and never was secrecy better guarded. Possessing the power of appointment to civil and military positions, the President filled the more important ones with creatures of his own, who had everything to gain and little to lose from the overthrow of the existing system. Such were the Minister of War, who controlled the army; the Minister of the Interior, who controlled the officials in the departments; and the Prefect of Police, who controlled the police of Paris.

The 2d of December, 1851, anniversary of the coronation of Napoleon I and of the battle of Austerlitz, was chosen as the fateful day. During the early morning hours many of the military and civil leaders of France, republican and

The Coup d'état.

monarchist, were arrested in bed and taken to prison. A battalion of infantry was sent to occupy the Legislative Chamber. Placards were posted on all the walls of Paris, pretending to explain the President's purposes. The Assembly was pronounced dissolved, universal suffrage was declared re-established, the people were convoked in their primary assemblies. The President explained that he must save the Republic from its enemies, the Monarchists and the Anarchists, who put "in jeopardy the repose of France," that he made the people of France arbiter between the Assembly and himself, "by invoking the solemn judgment of the only sovereign that I recognize in France, the people." To accomplish the security the nation sorely needed after so much turmoil, he proposed the following changes in the constitution: the President should hold office for ten years; ministers should be solely dependent upon him; there should be a council of state to prepare the laws and to discuss them before the legislative body; a legislative body to discuss and vote the laws, elected by universal suffrage; another assembly, "composed of all the illustrious persons of the country," to be the "guardian of the fundamental compact," and of the public liberties. "This system, created by the First Consul at the beginning of the century, has already given to France repose and prosperity; it will guarantee them to her again." The people were called upon to approve or disapprove these suggestions.

Events of December 2d.

The significance of all this was at first not apparent to those who read the placards. But signs of opposition began to show themselves as their meaning became clearer. Some of the deputies, going to their hall of meeting, found entrance prevented by the military. Withdrawing to another place, and proceeding to impeach the President, they were attacked by the troops, who arrested a large number, and took them off to prison. Thus the leaders of France, civil and military, were in custody, and the President saw no organized authority erect before him. This

was the work of the 2d. Would the people resent the high-handed acts of this usurper?

The President had not neglected to make unprecedented preparations for this contingency. His police controlled all the printing establishments, whence usually in periods of crisis emerged flaming appeals to revolt; also all the bell towers, whence in revolutionary times the tocsin was accustomed to ring out the appeal to insurrection. Nevertheless, on the 3d barricades were raised. On the 4th occurred the famous "massacre of the boulevards." Over 150 were killed and a large number wounded. Paris was cowed. The coup d'état was crowned with success. To prevent any possible rising of the provinces martial law was proclaimed in thirty-two departments, thousands of arbitrary arrests were made, and the work on which the Prince President entered on the night of December 2d was thoroughly carried out. Probably a hundred thousand arrests were made throughout France. All who appeared dangerous to Louis Napoleon were either transported, exiled, or imprisoned. This vigorous policy was aimed particularly at the Republicans, who were for years completely silenced.

The "massacre of the boulevards."

Having thus abolished all opposing leadership, Louis Napoleon appealed to the people for their opinion as to intrusting him with power to remodel the Constitution along the lines indicated in his proclamation. On December 20, 7,439,216 voted in favor of so doing, and only 640,737 voted in the negative. While the election was in no sense fair, while the issue presented was neither clear nor simple, while force and intimidation were resorted to, yet it was evident that a large majority of Frenchmen were willing to try again the experiment of a Napoleon.

The plébiscite.

The Republic, though officially continuing another year, was now dead. Louis Napoleon, though still nominally President, was in fact an absolute sovereign. It was a mere detail when a year later (November 21, 1852) the people of France were permitted to vote on the question of re-

Napoleon III, Emperor, Dec. 2, 1852.

establishing the imperial dignity, and of proclaiming Louis Napoleon Bonaparte emperor, under the name of Napoleon III. 7,824,189 Frenchmen voted yes; 253,145 voted no. On the anniversary of the coup d'état, December 2d, a day so fortunate for Bonapartes, Napoleon III was proclaimed Emperor of the French, and the Second Empire was established.

THE SECOND EMPIRE

The President who, by the endless witchery of a name, by a profitable absence of scruples, and by favorable circumstances, had known how to become an Emperor, was no mere vulgar adventurer, but was a man of ideas as well as audacity, of generosity as well as egoism, of humanitarian aspirations for the betterment of the world, as well as of a vivid perception of the pleasures of personal advancement. His ideas, expounded gracefully in writings and in speeches, were largely derived from a study of the life of the Great Napoleon. Long before he became President of the Republic he published a book called "Napoleonic Ideas," an appraisal of the historic significance of the First Emperor. It appears from this that Napoleon I had two purposes in life. One was the preservation of all that was valuable in the Revolution, the foundation of the state and of society upon a solid, enduring basis—which could only be accomplished by the exercise of absolute power on the part of the ruler—and the other was that this great end having been attained, the preliminary, probationary period of despotism would give way, and the edifice would then be "crowned with liberty," which it were unsafe earlier to bestow—that through the training received from an active and intelligent despot France would be fitted to enter upon the life of freedom, which appears to be the goal as well as the dream of modern times.

Napoleon III, 1808-1873.

That the latter part of Napoleon's plans, the bestowal of free institutions upon France, had not been achieved was, in his nephew's opinion, no fault of his, but of those ignorant

and reactionary nations which had waged war upon him, had defeated him at Waterloo, and had thus cut right athwart his beneficent activity. However inaccurate a judgment this may have been, it was of importance, as it furnished the new ruler with a programme. He declared his desire to finish the work his uncle had been forced to leave unfinished, to restore order, so sadly compromised by the unstable, feverish régimes since 1815—and this he could only do, he held, by exercising autocratic power—and then to cap the structure with liberty in all its plenitude. The history of the Second Empire falls into these two divisions—autocracy unlimited from 1852 to 1860, and a growing liberalism from 1860 to 1870, when the Empire collapsed, its programme woefully unrealized.

The programme of the new Emperor.

The political institutions of the early Empire merit description. They were adopted largely from the Consulate. The machinery was elaborate, and mainly valuable for purposes of deception. The principle of universal suffrage, proclaimed by the Republic of 1848, was preserved, was indeed in theory made the basis of the whole imperial régime, but was ingeniously rendered quite innocuous to the autocrat. There was a Legislative Body of 251 members elected every six years by universal suffrage. But most modest was to be the rôle of this assembly. It was to be no real parliament, such as had existed under Louis XVIII, Charles X, Louis Philippe, and the late Republic. It could not even elect its own president, who was appointed, as were the vice-presidents, by the Emperor. It could not propose legislation. All bills were laid before it by the Emperor. It could not question the ministers, or by adverse votes overthrow them, as they were appointed by the Emperor and were responsible to him alone. Its sessions were public, but might be made secret upon the request of five members. Thus when discussion became exciting it could be prevented from becoming noised abroad that there was dissension within the state; indeed, no reports of these debates might be pub-

The political institutions of the Empire.

Parliament carefully muffled.

lished by the newspapers, save an official minute, dry, analytical, concise, drawn up by the presiding officer, himself, as has been said, an appointee of the Emperor. Political eloquence was the evil spirit carefully to be exorcised. No more speeches of a Lamartine, inflaming and shaping outside opinion. Parliament was absolutely insulated from the public. Even the subjects of legislation on which it might express approval or disapproval were carefully limited, a large legislative power belonging to the Emperor alone. It did not even control taxation. Though it voted the budget each year, the Emperor had the right during its recesses to contract extraordinary loans, which, of course, meant that he virtually possessed the vital power of taxation. This was really the old régime back again.

Its legislative power limited.

The Senate. There was also a Senate, composed of the Emperor's appointees—marshals, admirals, cardinals, and others, irremovable, serving for life. This body had no legislative power, no executive power, no judicial power. It was declared "the guardian of the fundamental law"; that is, the Constitution. All laws must be submitted to it, not for discussion and possible amendment, but that it might oppose their promulgation if it found them opposed to the Constitution. It was to interpret doubtful or obscure phrases of the Constitution; it might propose amendments, *senatus consulta*, which would become definite when sanctioned by the Emperor. Its powers were nominally extensive, purposely vague, and might easily become entirely inoperative. The Senate, as a matter of fact, was the mere tool of the Emperor.

The Council of State. There was also a Council of State, appointed by the Emperor and removable by him, with power to frame laws to be submitted by the ministers to the Legislative Body, but with no power of legislating.

The Emperor. In the midst of these numerous wheels stood the master mechanician, the Emperor, Napoleon III. His attributes were real and sweeping in their range. He had the com-

mand of the army and the navy, decided upon war and peace, could alone conclude treaties of peace, of commerce, of political alliance. He was the fountain of justice, possessing the full power of pardon. He appointed to all important offices. The ministers were absolutely dependent on him. He appointed the Council of State, the Senate, the High Court, and, as we have seen, could largely manipulate the Legislative Body, which, moreover, he alone could convene, adjourn, and dissolve. He alone had the right to propose laws; the Council of State worked them out in detail, and the Legislative Body approved; after that he, as if his power were not already sufficient, could sanction and promulgate them. Having dissolved the legislature, he need not call another for six months.

L'état! C'est moi.

In short, the Emperor was the state. All this machinery did not disguise, but rather accentuated his autocracy. The important fact for several years was not the activity of these various bodies, but of the one man. Parliamentary institutions, until 1860, were little else than a sounding-board for the wishes of the monarch.

It is true that France had a Legislative Body, which was, however, thoroughly bottled up, as we have seen. This body was elected by universal suffrage, but the elections were controlled in various ways by the Government. It proposed in every district an official candidate, whom it forced all office-holders to support actively. It hampered in numerous and ingenious ways independent candidates. All meetings for campaign purposes were prohibited as "prejudicial to the free exercise of the suffrage." The press, so essential an aid in any free political life, was thoroughly shackled, so that practically only those newspapers favorable to the Government could flourish. No new journal might be established without the preliminary permission of the Government. Every change of editor or manager must likewise be officially approved. Also, as a guarantee for good behavior, a deposit must be made, proportioned to

The press shackled.

the importance of the place of publication, which might be as high as 50,000 francs for Paris, as high as 15,000 for the departments. A system of warnings was developed, whereby after two warnings that articles had appeared disagreeable to the Government, the publication might be indefinitely suspended. New press misdeameanors were created. To describe the sessions of the Legislative Body other than by the publication of the official minutes was one of these. To publish false news another. Press cases were taken from juries, who showed a tendency to be just, and handed over to special courts which had the right to act summarily.

Under this system political life was completely stamped out, intellectual independence well-nigh extinguished. Repression was all-powerful and endlessly pervasive. France was no longer a land of freedom. For several years she breathed a mephitic atmosphere of intellectual humiliation and effacement.

The Empire both repressive and progressive.

In return for all this Napoleon sought to entertain and divert and enrich France. His government was "both repressive and progressive—repressive of whatever imperiled his power, progressive in devotion to whatever might adorn and strengthen it." [1] Marrying at this time a young Spanish woman of twenty-six years, of remarkable beauty and of noble birth, Mlle. Eugénie de Montijo, "a marriage of love," as he told the French people, the Tuileries immediately became the center of a court life probably the most brilliant and luxurious of the nineteenth century. Fête followed fête in swift succession. Life could not be more lavish or more gay. Sumptuous and showy, the balls, dinners, military parades, illuminations were, it was given out, not mere self-indulgence for the favored few, but were of advantage to all France. Did they not encourage business and trade? A shower of gold wherever it fell was considered highly fructifying. Some

[1] Gorce, Histoire du Second Empire, II, 3.

criticized, asking if it was worth while to overthrow parliament in order to put an orchestra in its place, but in the main, joy was unconfined; and bourgeois society paid court society the genuine compliment of imitation.

The Emperor's activities.

But pleasure did not engross the attention of the new sovereign. His reign was distinguished by a spirit of great enterprise, kindly feeling for the masses, good works of benefit to the different classes of society. The Emperor was no incorrigible conservative like Metternich, but a very modern man, anxious that his reign should be memorable for works of utility, of improvement. He had a genuine love for humanity, a sincere desire to help those who are heavy laden. He founded hospitals and asylums freely, and relief societies of various kinds for the poor. The free distribution of medicines was provided for. In 1864 laborers were given for the first time in French history the right to strike, which has proved a most important weapon in their hands for the betterment of their conditions.

Economic development.

Banks were organized from which landed proprietors, both great and small, might obtain loans on easy terms to enable them to carry on improvements in agriculture. The railways, denounced by Thiers as "the costly luxury of the rich," "toys for the Parisians," were extended in a few years from a mileage of 2,000 to one of 6,000. Steamboat lines were established to enlarge the markets of France by transatlantic commerce. Canals were begun. For the Emperor was distinctly a man of his age, responsive to new ideas, and sincerely enthusiastic in promoting all the progress in the arts and trades which the marvelous discoveries of modern science rendered possible. No class of the population was ignored in these schemes. In Napoleon's opinion, preceding governments had failed precisely because they had considered only a class—the Legitimist monarchy only the aristocracy, the Orleanist monarchy only the rich bourgeoisie. The Empire, he said, stood for no class, but for the nation in all its entirety. A great international exposition was held

in Paris in 1855, bringing thousands of visitors to Paris, and giving a distinct impulsion to material progress by its impressive revelation of the wealth of the tools at man's disposal.

Paris beautified.

A grandiose scheme for the modernization and beautification of Paris was projected, which, carried out by Baron Haussmann, made it the most attractive and comfortable capital in Europe. This transformation of the capital, indeed, was one of the principal undertakings of the Second Empire, an undertaking in process of execution during the entire course of the reign.

General prosperity.

All these enterprises greatly stimulated commerce. An era of unwonted speculation now set in. The Stock Exchange reflected vividly the buoyancy and daring of the period. Fortunes were made quickly, and of a size hitherto unknown in France. Thus, in an air of general prosperity, of economic expansion, of multifarious activity, men forgot their loss of liberty, and even the great famines, great floods, and important business failures which occurred during this period did not produce the usual unrest. They were regarded as merely the reverse of what was, in the main, a most attractive picture.

In 1856 Napoleon III was at the zenith of his power. The Empire had been recognized by all the other states of Europe. The Emperor had, with England and Piedmont as allies, waged a successful war against Russia in the Crimea.[1] He was supposed to have the best army in Europe, and he was honored in the face of all the world by having Paris chosen as the seat of the congress which drew up the treaties at the end of that war. And now an heir was born to him, the Prince Imperial, as interesting to his day and as ill-fated as the King of Rome had been in his. Fortune seemed to have emptied her full horn of plenty upon the author of the coup d'état.

The Congress of Paris, 1856.

But the Empire had already reached its apogee, though

[1] See Chapter XXVIII.

this was not evident for some time. The Emperor's policy had thus far been dominated by a very clear perception of self-interest. Now it was to change, become less precise, bolder, and more uncertain, calculated to arouse criticism and to create a lack of confidence, a general sense of insecurity. In preparing France for the Empire while yet he was the dictatorial President of 1852, Napoleon had taken special care to reassure her on one point. As the First Empire had been a period of unexampled war, would not the Second be the same? In a speech at Bordeaux, which became famous, Napoleon had with great deliberation treated this subject. "Nevertheless," said he, "there is a fear to which I ought to reply. In a spirit of distrust certain people say: the Empire is war. But I say: the Empire is peace. I confess, however, that I, like the Emperor, have many conquests to make. I wish, like him, to win and to reconcile the hostile parties," and to achieve economic and moral victories of various kinds. ". . . Such are the conquests that I contemplate, and all of you who surround me, who desire, like myself, the welfare of the fatherland, you are my soldiers." To the latter sort of conquests the Emperor gave himself, as we have seen, with energy and success. But the other part of his promise he did not adhere to. Wars were frequent in his reign, wars not forced upon him but created by him, wars disastrous to himself and to his dynasty, as the more famous ones of the First Empire had been to the First Napoleon.

The Emperor's policy of peace.

The policy of the Empire at home after 1860 was determined by the policy abroad. This was determined by the Emperor, who had uncontrolled rights of making war, which rights he unwisely used. The beginning of his serious troubles was his participation in the Italian war of 1859.

The Italian War of 1859.

To understand the course of the Second Empire from 1860 to 1870 one must study the part played by Napoleon

III in the making of modern Italy, the consequences of which were to be for him so unexpected, so far-reaching, and in the end so disastrous. And correctly to appraise that policy we must first trace the history of the rise of the Kingdom of Italy.

CHAPTER X

CAVOUR AND THE CREATION OF THE KINGDOM OF ITALY

CAVOUR AND NAPOLEON III

Reaction in Italy after 1848.

With the failure of the revolutions of 1848-9 Italy returned to her former condition, of division into small states, arbitrary government, and domination of Austria. The punishment of Liberals was general, and at times savage, particularly in Lombardy-Venetia and in Naples. In the latter case the proceedings were so iniquitous that Gladstone, in a flaming pamphlet, denounced the Neapolitan government as the very negation of God erected into a system. After the Pope's return to Rome, his government was guilty of such misdeeds that its supporter, Louis Napoleon, protested, though in vain. In Tuscany the government was characterized by severity, in Lombardy and Venetia by long-continued persecutions. Constitutions that had been granted were generally revoked. One state in the peninsula formed a brilliant exception to this sorry system of reaction—Piedmont. Though badly defeated on the battlefield at Custozza in 1848, and at Novara in 1849, it had gained an important moral victory. An Italian prince had risked his throne twice for the cause of Italian independence, conduct which for multitudes of Italians marked the House of Savoy as the leader of the future. Moreover, the king who had done this, Charles Albert, had also granted his people a constitution. He had abdicated after the battle of Novara, and his son, Victor Emmanuel II, then twenty-nine years of age, had come to the throne.

tor manuel 1820-3.

Austria offered Victor Emmanuel easy terms of peace if he would abrogate this constitution, and prospects of aggrandizement were dangled before him. He absolutely refused. This was a turning point in his career, in the history of Piedmont, and in that of Italy. It won him the popular title of the Honest King. It made Piedmont the one hope of Italian Liberals. She was national and constitutional. Henceforth her leadership was assured. For the next ten years her history is the history of the making of the Kingdom of Italy. Thither Liberals who were driven out of the other states took refuge, and their number was large.

Piedmont a constitutional state.

Victor Emmanuel was a brave soldier, a man, not of brilliant mind, but of sound and independent judgment, of absolute loyalty to his word, of intense patriotism. And he had from 1850 on, in his leading minister, Count Camillo di Cavour, one of the greatest statesmen and diplomatists of the nineteenth century.

Count Cavour, 1810-1861.

Cavour was born in 1810. His family belonged to the nobility of Piedmont. He received a military education and joined the army as an engineer. But by his liberal opinions, freely expressed, he incurred the hostility of his superiors and was kept for a time in semi-imprisonment. He resigned his commission in 1831, and for the next fifteen years lived the life of a country gentleman, developing his estates. By studying the new scientific processes of agriculture, by introducing and inducing others to introduce machinery, by experimenting with canal irrigation and artificial fertilizers, he was largely instrumental in revolutionizing farming in Piedmont. During these years, to vary the monotony of existence, he visited France and England repeatedly, interested particularly in political and economic questions. He was anxious to play a part in politics himself, though he saw no chance in a country as yet without representative institutions. "Oh! if I were an Englishman," he said, "by this time I should be something, and my name would not be wholly unknown." Meanwhile, he

studied abroad the institutions he desired for his own country, particularly the English parliamentary system. Night after night he sat in the gallery of the House of Commons, seeking to make himself thoroughly familiar with its modes of procedure. Cavour's mind was the opposite of Mazzini's, practical, positive, not poetical and speculative. He wrote on social and economic questions. Particularly did he advocate the building of railroads as tending effectively to promote the moral unity of Italy, which must precede political unity. They would sweep away local jealousies and bind the Italians of different sections together commercially. Rome ought to be the center of the system, which should unite the whole peninsula. In all these plans for the material enrichment of Piedmont and of Italy, he was dominated by the patriotic consideration that they would contribute to the achievement of independence and unity. In 1847, when the censorship of the press was abolished in Piedmont, Cavour saw that his opportunity had come, left his retirement, and founded a liberal newspaper called *Il Risorgimento*. Its aims were "independence, union between the princes and people, and reforms." He welcomed with enthusiasm the creation in 1848 of a parliament for Piedmont and of a constitution, which he had, indeed, been one of the boldest to demand. "Italy," he said, "must make herself by means of liberty, or we must give up trying to make her." This belief in parliamentary institutions Cavour held tenaciously all through his life, even when at times they seemed to be a hindrance to his policies. He believed that in the end, sooner or later, the people reach the truth of a matter. He was elected to the first Piedmontese Parliament, was taken into the cabinet in 1850, and became prime minister in 1852. He held this position for the remainder of his life, with the exception of a few months, proving himself a great statesman and an incomparable diplomat.

His interest in political and economic questions.

Becomes an editor.

Cavour prime minister, 1852.

Cavour had said in 1850, with an optimism and a courage not daunted by the disastrous defeats of Custozza and No-

vara, that if Piedmont would "gather to itself all the living forces in Italy it would be in a position to lead our mother country to those high destinies whereunto she is called." To accomplish this, he now said, "Piedmont must begin by raising herself, by re-establishing in Europe as well as in Italy a position and a credit equal to her ambition." He threw himself with enthusiasm and intelligence into his preliminary work of making Piedmont, a small and poor country, strong, vigorous, modern, of calling the attention of the great powers to this little state beneath the Alps. To accomplish this the army must be reorganized and strengthened, the fleet built up, fortifications erected. This would involve immense expenditure. But Piedmont's debt had been greatly increased by the late war. The interest on it had mounted from about two million lire in 1847 to thirty million in 1852. There were large annual deficits; bankruptcy appeared imminent. Economy rather than expenditure seemed imperative. Not so thought Cavour. He believed in spending freely on improvements, because they were necessary, and because in the end larger revenues would result. He urged large appropriations not only for the army, but for public works. He encouraged agriculture, completed the railway system of Piedmont, stimulated commerce and industry by treaties of commerce with other states, secularized some of the monastic lands, levied new taxes, all this, of course, by securing the necessary laws from Parliament. The result of all this activity was that Piedmont entered upon a period of rapid growth in material prosperity, and the new burdens were as easily borne as the old had been. Cavour was thus able to create a large and well-equipped army of ninety thousand men, remarkable for a state whose population was only five million. And this facilitated his next object, which was to secure for Piedmont an ally among the great powers, for this he considered absolutely necessary if she were to accomplish her high mission. Cavour believed, as did all true patriots, that Austria must be driven

Policy of economic development.

Cavour seeks a military ally.

out of Italy before any Italian regeneration could be achieved. But he did not believe with Mazzini and others that the Italians could accomplish this feat alone. In his opinion the history of the last forty years had shown that plots and insurrections would not avail. It was essential to win the aid of a great military power comparable in strength and discipline to Austria. This explains why he urged that Piedmont participate in the Crimean war.

Why Piedmont participated in the Crimean war.

The Crimean war was fought in 1854 and 1855 by France and England against Russia, to prevent the latter power from dismembering the Turkish Empire. There seemed to be no reason for a small and struggling state like Piedmont to interfere. It had no serious quarrel with Russia. The preservation or dismemberment of Turkey was for it a matter of only remote concern. Yet Cavour, looking beyond the immediate question, believed that Piedmont's and Italy's interests would be subserved by an alliance offensive and defensive with the two western powers against Russia. For he believed that thus Piedmont would win the good will of her two allies, and might take her place as an equal at the council board of European diplomacy. Such a position this state, petty and poor, in comparison with France and England and Austria and Russia, with barely five millions of people, had hitherto not held. Among the "powers" she was practically unrecognized. For reasons, then, quite remote from the real question at issue, and reasons, therefore, which Cavour could not publicly give, he wished to use this opportunity. His plan was bitterly denounced and generally condemned. It was said that the quarrel was none of Piedmont's, that by sending her army to the Crimea she would be exposing her own frontiers, that her finances would be ruined by this additional strain, that she should husband her money and her men for her own struggle, which must ultimately come with Austria. Her resources would be none too great at best. Cavour himself called the risks of the venture "enormous."

Cavour at the Congress of Paris.

But he succeeded in carrying it through. Seventeen thousand Sardinians were sent to the Crimea, where they proved excellent soldiers and won distinction. But Cavour was not aiming primarily at military glory, but at moral and diplomatic victories. Piedmont had entered the alliance unconditionally. She was not promised that, participating in the war, she would be permitted to participate in the making of the peace, and when the Congress of Paris was called in 1856 Cavour started out not knowing whether he would be admitted to it, owing to Austria's opposition. He was going to Paris, he said, in order "to sniff the air." But a few days after his arrival he was informed that he would be received. The two great powers could not well consent to the ignoring of their ally. Cavour had won the interest of Napoleon III, who in 1855 had asked him, "What can be done for Italy?" Cavour had replied by a memorandum. Now in Paris, after the treaty had been made, Napoleon caused the question of Italy—a question foreign to the purpose of the Congress—to be brought before it. This was Cavour's chance. The Italian situation was to be discussed in a congress in which Austria sat. Clarendon, representing England, indignantly denounced the Papal Government as a "disgrace to Europe," and Ferdinand's misrule in Naples as crying for the intervention of the civilized world. This speech created an extraordinary sensation. Moreover, by bringing the Italian question forward, it furnished Cavour an opportunity to speak. His speech was brief, cautious, and bold. The main cause of the evils from which Italy suffered was Austria, he declared. "Austria is the arch-enemy of Italian independence; the permanent danger to the only free nation in Italy, the nation which I have the honor to represent."

Discussion of the Italian question.

Moral victory for Cavour.

Cavour returned from Paris with no material advantage gained, but his moral victory was complete. Piedmont had participated in a council of the great powers. Austria had been indicted publicly in a great international congress.

So had the Pope, and so had the King of Naples. Piedmont had again shown that she was the champion of all Italy. Many who, influenced by Mazzini, had hitherto believed that Italy's salvation lay in a republic, began to change their opinion, and to entertain an increasing confidence in the patriotism and statesmanship and military power of the Piedmontese monarchy. Cavour had gained for himself a great reputation as a diplomatist. Prince Metternich, now in retirement, and a connoisseur in such matters, is said to have remarked: "There is only one diplomatist in Europe, but unfortunately he is against us; it is M. de Cavour." Cavour was now one of the commanding personalities of Europe. His position in his own country was more solid than ever.

Army strengthened.

After the Congress of Paris Piedmont proceeded still further to make herself the model state of Italy. Laws were passed strengthening the army. Industry expanded under wise legislation. Education was stimulated, and the National Society was organized to encourage the growth in the other states of Italy of a sentiment in favor of Piedmont. The motto of this society was: "Independence and Unity; out with the Austrians and the Pope." The subjects of other states were to be won from their loyalty to their own princes to loyalty to Piedmont. A revolution in opinion and sentiment was to be effected that later a political revolution might be easier. This society was successful. Many, like Manin, who had hitherto been Republicans, renounced their republicanism and declared themselves willing under certain conditions to follow Piedmont. "Make Italy," wrote Manin, "and we are with you; if not, not." The National Society spread rapidly throughout the other states. By it Liberals everywhere were drawn together under the banner of the House of Savoy, and a state of mind was created favorable to the overthrow of the petty princes and the exaltation of Piedmont.

Founding of the National Society.

Cavour had returned from Paris hoping that France might shortly be induced to aid Piedmont. The Emperor

Cavour and Napoleon III.

had in 1855 asked what he could do for Italy, and Cavour had responded with all explicitness. Suddenly all hope of this consummation seemed dashed to the ground by a murderous attempt upon the life of Napoleon by certain Italians, led by Orsini (January 14, 1858). This, however, did not deflect Napoleon from the alliance with Sardinia toward which he had been tending for some time. The motives that influenced him to take the step momentous for himself as well as for Italy were numerous. The principle of nationality which he held tenaciously, and which largely determined the foreign policy of his entire reign, prompted him in this direction—the principle, namely, that peoples of the same race and language had the right to be united politically. He sought, as we shall see, to further this principle in several cases, with results very disastrous to himself and to France.

Further, Napoleon had long been interested in Italy. He had himself taken part in the revolutionary movements there in 1831, and had probably been a member of the Carbonari. Moreover, it was one of his ambitions to tear up the treaties of 1815, treaties that sealed the humiliation of the Napoleonic dynasty. These treaties still formed the basis of the Italian political system in 1858. Again, he was probably lured on by a desire to win glory for his throne, and there was always the chance, too, of gaining territory. Fear, also, may have influenced him. Orsini had not been the first Italian who had tried to assassinate the Emperor; he might not be the last, if he should do nothing for Italy.

The interview at Plombières.

At any rate, the Emperor decided to draw closer to Piedmont. Hardly six months after Orsini's attempt, he invited Cavour to meet him at Plombières, a watering place in the Vosges mountains. The meeting, which occurred July 21, 1858, was shrouded in utmost mystery. Only four persons in Piedmont knew of it, including Victor Emmanuel and La Marmora. The ministers of Napoleon were kept in ignorance of it. The Emperor, always a dreamer

and conspirator, was now closeted with a conspirator far more skilful than himself. The interview of Plombières is one of the most famous in the history of the century. There were long conversations, a memorable description of which was contained in a letter which Cavour immediately sent to Victor Emmanuel and which constitutes our chief source of information concerning the intrigues of two unscrupulous men conspiring for different reasons to bring about a war.[1] No written agreement or treaty of alliance was made, but it was agreed verbally that France and Piedmont should go to war with Austria, but only upon some pretext which could be justified before Europe, and which would make it appear that the two powers were not bent upon revolution, but that they were merely repelling Austrian aggression. A rising in Massa and Carrara was to serve as the pretext. If Austria should begin war against Piedmont, France would come to the latter's assistance, and if the allies were victorious Italy should be reconstituted as follows: Lombardy and Venetia should be added to Piedmont, as should also the duchies and parts of the Papal States, the Romagna and the Legations. Austria would thus be completely expelled from the peninsula, and Victor Emmanuel would rule over a kingdom of Northern Italy. The rest of the Papal States, with the exception of Rome and a region round about should be added to Tuscany which would thus form a kingdom of Central Italy. These two kingdoms and that of Naples and the Papal States should then be united into an Italian Confederation under the presidency of the Pope who might consequently feel compensated for the loss of most of his possessions. In return for her aid France was to receive Savoy and possibly Nice. The Emperor urged a marriage between his cousin Prince Napoleon and the daughter of Victor Emmanuel. No definite agreement was then made. Prince Napoleon was a debauchee of forty-three. Princess Clotilde was a young

A conspiracy to bring about a war.

The conditions agreed upon.

[1] Chiala, Lettere edite ed inedite di Camillo Cavour, II, 568 seq. 2nd edit.

girl of sixteen. Ultimately this sacrifice was made—so revolting to Victor Emmanuel and the Piedmontese. Early in December 1858 these verbal agreements were put into writing, though not, it would seem, although the matter is most obscure, into a binding treaty.

Difficulties and dangers of Cavour's position.

Though Cavour had apparently achieved the dream of his life, an alliance with a great military power, his position during the next few months, between the meeting at Plombières, July 1858, and the final declaration of war, April 1859, was one of extraordinary difficulty. He had invoked a powerful spirit. Could he control it, or would he become the mere sport of it? Might not Napoleon, notably of a changeable mind, change it now at the critical time, leaving Piedmont high and dry, at the mercy of her powerful neighbor, Austria, leaving Cavour and all his policy a wreck? Might not the other powers, getting wind of the conspiracy, step in to prevent war, the necessity of which was the very basis of Cavour's policy for the creation of modern Italy, as it was of Bismarck's policy later for the creation of modern Germany? If the war should come and Napoleon should be faithful to his engagements, might not the greatest danger lie right there? Might not a victorious Napoleon in Italy do what a victorious Napoleon had done in Italy before, use his opportunity for his own advantage and not for that of the Italians, whom he ostensibly came to succor? Cavour did not wish to play a game for Napoleon. The risk at any rate must be run.

Cavour's diplomacy.

It had been stipulated by Napoleon that he would support Piedmont in a war with Austria if Austria appeared as the aggressor. Cavour's policy therefore for the next months was to provoke Austria to this end. It was a period of great tension for the Piedmontese minister, in which he displayed extraordinary resourcefulness, coolness, craft, unscrupulousness. He wove ceaselessly a marvelous web of tortuous intrigue. Now Napoleon seemed about to withdraw; now a congress of the powers to cut clean through the

projects of these conspirators. Into the interesting details of these machinations we cannot go. In the end they were successful, and Austria was goaded by Cavour's conduct to take the fatal step. She demanded that Piedmont disarm within three days, otherwise war would be declared. War was precisely the thing Cavour wanted, and for which he had for months been ceaselessly working. He had contrived to make Austria appear the aggressor and now the case had arisen for which Napoleon had promised his aid. Piedmont refused the Austrian ultimatum, and at the end of April 1859 war began. The public opinion of other nations blamed Austria and exonerated Piedmont, most unjustly, for this war was Cavour's, desired by him and brought about by him with extraordinary skill. That he had succeeded in throwing the whole responsibility for it on his enemy was only further evidence of the cunning of his fine Italian hand.

The Austro-Sardinian War.

The Austro-Sardinian war lasted only about two months. The Austrian armies were large but incompetently led. They wasted the time before the arrival of the French troops when Piedmont was at their mercy. When the French arrived, the Emperor at their head, active fighting began. The theater of war was limited to Lombardy. The battles of Magenta (June 4) and of Solferino (June 24) were victories for the Allies. The latter was one of the greatest battles of the nineteenth century. It lasted eleven hours, more than 260,000 men were engaged, nearly 800 cannon. The Allies lost over 17,000 men, the Austrians about 22,000. All Lombardy was conquered, and Milan was occupied. It seemed that Venetia could be easily overrun and the termination of Austrian rule in Italy effected, and Napoleon's statement that he would free Italy "from the Alps to the Adriatic" accomplished. Suddenly Napoleon halted in the full tide of success, sought an interview with the Emperor of Austria at Villafranca, and there on July 11th, without consulting the wishes of his ally, concluded a famous armistice. The terms agreed upon by the two Emperors were:

The campaign of 1859.

The Preliminaries of Villafranca.

(1) The creation of an Italian Confederation under the honorary presidency of the Pope. (2) The cession to France, and the transfer by France to Sardinia, of the province of Lombardy. (3) The inclusion of Venetia in the Italian Confederation, as a province, however, under the Crown of Austria. (4) The restoration of the Grand Duke of Tuscany and the Duke of Modena to their respective states, whence they had just been driven by popular uprisings.

Reasons for Napoleon's action.

The considerations that determined Napoleon to stop in the middle of a successful campaign, and before he had attained the object for which he had come into Italy, were many and serious. While victorious on five battlefields he had no reason to feel elated. Magenta and Solferino had been victories, but he saw that they might easily have been defeats. He had conquered Lombardy, but Austria had 150,000 men in Venetia, and 100,000 more were advancing to join them. Austria's troops would then outnumber his. Moreover Austria would now plant herself firmly in the famous Quadrilateral, whose fortresses could only be taken, if at all, after long and difficult sieges. Furthermore, the control of events was plainly slipping from him. The effect of the Piedmontese propaganda in the other states of Italy was already becoming apparent. During the war the Romagna had thrown off its allegiance to the Pope, the authority of the rulers of Modena and Parma had been renounced by their rebellious subjects, and all three—the Romagna, the two duchies, and Tuscany also, were clamoring for annexation to Piedmont. If the war should continue the other Italians might show the same determination and Napoleon might find that, instead of an enlarged kingdom of Piedmont, a kingdom of all Italy had been created, and many of the leading men in France were denouncing as very dangerous to France this possible creation of a powerful state on her southeastern border. The French Catholics were opposed to the continuation of a war so full of menace to the Pope. Moreover, Prussia was mobilizing her troops on the Rhine

and was contemplating intervention, and France was in no condition to fight Austria and Prussia combined. Also, the Emperor had been touched by the horrors of the battlefield. "The poor people, the poor people, what a horrible thing is war," he was heard to say more than once at Solferino.

Austria was eager for peace. Her army was badly led. She was involved in trouble with Hungary. She did not relish being saved by Prussia, for Prussia might then seize her leadership in Germany. Francis Joseph, too, like Napoleon, was horrified by war. "Better lose a province," he said after Solferino, "than be present again at so awful a spectacle." Thus both rulers were willing to come to terms.

Austria eager for peace.

The news of the armistice came as a cruel disappointment to the Italians, dashing their hopes just as they were apparently about to be realized. The Government of Victor Emmanuel had not even been consulted. In intense indignation at the faithlessness of Napoleon, overwrought by the excessive strain under which he had long been laboring, Cavour completely lost his self-control, urged desperate measures upon the King and, when they were declined, in a fit of rage, threw up his office. The King by overruling Cavour showed himself wiser than his gifted minister. As disappointed as the latter, he saw more clearly than did Cavour that though Piedmont had not gained all that she had hoped to, yet she had gained much. It was wiser to take what one could get and bide the future than to imperil all by some mad course. Here was one of the great moments where the independence and common sense of Victor Emmanuel were of great and enduring service to his country.

Resignation of Cavour.

Napoleon had not done all that he had planned for Italy, yet he had rendered a very important service. He had secured Lombardy for Piedmont. It should also be noted that he himself acknowledged that the failure to carry out the whole programme had cancelled any claim he had upon the annexation of Savoy and Nice to France.

Piedmont acquires Lombardy.

ANNEXATIONS AFTER VILLAFRANCA

Thus by the preliminaries of Villafranca, embodied later in the Peace of Zurich, November 10, 1859, the Emperor of the French and the Emperor of Austria put an end to the process of Italian unification shortly after it had begun. Piedmont had grown by the addition of Lombardy and that was all. Austria was still an Italian power, and by the terms agreed upon was to be a member of the projected Italian Confederation. That she could use that position to continue her leadership in Italy was proved by her success in using the German Confederation for purposes of leadership in Germany. The Pope was still a temporal ruler and his power indeed was to be augmented by the presidency of the Confederation. Thus the Austrian Emperor and the Pope stood in the way of Italian aspirations as before. No wonder that Cavour said, though incorrectly, that all the efforts Piedmont had made during the past ten years had gone for nought. But the Peace of Zurich was destined never to be carried out save in one respect that Lombardy was added to Piedmont. Victor Emmanuel saw what Cavour failed to see, that the chapter was not closed but that it might be carried further, that central Italy at least might be drawn into the enlarged Kingdom of Piedmont.

Central Italy.

The situation in central Italy was this: During the war the rulers of Modena, Parma, Tuscany, had been overthrown, and the Pope's authority in Romagna, the northern part of his dominions, had been destroyed. Assemblies called in those states by revolutionary leaders voted, in August 1859, in favor of annexation to Piedmont. Thus the provinces of central Italy hurled defiance at the two Emperors who had decided at Villafranca that the rulers of those countries should be restored. Piedmont declined their offer at the time, knowing the opposition of Napoleon, and fearing to offend him, lest he might then withdraw from Italy entirely, thereby leaving Piedmont alone and exposed to Austrian

attack. But unofficially Piedmont gave them encouragement to hold out for annexation.

Impossibility of restoring the old order.

The Italians of the central states stood firm. It was evident that the former rulers could only be restored by force and Napoleon promised that force should not be used, either French or Austrian, to accomplish their restoration. For months this anomalous situation continued, harassing to every one. The central states, under the leadership of Piedmontese statesmen who had gone to them to assume direction, revised and rendered uniform their laws, and created a common military force that they might in the end bring about fusion with Piedmont. Diplomacy suggested a congress which was never convened, and for some time things drifted. Slowly the whole confused situation began to clarify. Napoleon came to see that if the peoples were left to themselves they would never restore their rulers but would insist upon union with Piedmont; that, moreover, the federation under the presidency of the Pope could never be brought about except by force. He saw also that the restoration of the rulers to their duchies would be an advantage to Austria but not at all to France. He had no desire that Austria should be again predominant in the peninsula. Other events co-operated to hasten a solution. In England, in June 1859, a new election had occurred and a ministry had come into office which was very friendly to the cause of Italian unity, and which particularly wished the Italians to be strong enough to be independent of the French. The English Government protested against the employment of French or Austrian forces to repress the clearly expressed will of the people of central Italy and to restore the princes. This was England's great service to the Italians. "The people of the duchies have as much right to change their sovereigns," said Lord Palmerston, "as the English people or the French, or the Belgian or the Swedish. The annexation of the duchies to Piedmont will be an unfathomable good to Italy."

England's participation in affairs.

Cavour returns to office.

Another event tending toward the solution of the question was the return of Cavour to power in January 1860, after an absence of six months. Cavour saw that the annexation of central Italy to Piedmont could be effected only with Napoleon's consent, which, therefore, must be secured. But Napoleon would not yet give it. It was clear that a bargain must be made. Piedmont could have the annexations for a price and that price was the cession of Savoy and Nice to France, which Napoleon had not claimed before as he had not carried out the agreement of Plombières, but which he now demanded as compensation for the creation of an important state on the southeastern border of France, and because he wished, by enlarging the national boundaries, to allay the sharp criticism which his Italian policy had aroused at home. It was finally agreed that plébiscites should be taken in the states of central Italy to see if they wished annexation to Piedmont, and in Savoy and Nice to see if they wished annexation to France. Thus, in theory, the principle would be upheld that peoples have a right to dispose of themselves.

Annexation to Piedmont.

These plébiscites in Italy resulted as was expected. (March 11-12, 1860.) The vote was almost unanimous in favor of annexation.

Modena, Parma, Tuscany and the Romagna were thus added to the Kingdom of Piedmont, which had already received Lombardy. The Pope issued the major excommunication against the authors of this spoliation of his dominions (Romagna), but Victor Emmanuel accepted the sovereignty thus offered him, and on April 2nd, 1860, the first parliament of the enlarged kingdom met in Turin. A small state of less than 5,000,000 had grown to one of 11,000,000 within a year. This was the most important change in the political system of Europe since 1815. As far as Italy was concerned it made waste paper of the treaties of 1815. It constituted the most damaging breach made thus far in the work of the Congress of Vienna. What

that congress had decided was to be a mere "geographical expression" was now a nation in formation. And this was being accomplished by the triumphant assertion of two principles utterly odious to the monarchs of 1815, the right of revolution and the right of peoples to determine their own destinies for themselves, for these annexations were the result of war and of plébiscites.

Cession of Savoy and Nice by the Treaty of Turin, March 24, 1860.

But Piedmont's triumph was not without an element of bitterness for it had been bought with a price, and that price was the cession of Savoy and Nice, with a population of about 700,000, to France. Savoy was the cradle of the ruling house and its abandonment was a great humiliation, but it was, in Cavour's opinion, inevitable. Because of it Garibaldi, a citizen of Nice, attacked him in Parliament with remarkable vehemence. "You have made me," he said, "a stranger in the land of my birth." "The act," replied Cavour with impressive dignity, "that has made this gulf between us, was the most painful duty of my life. By what I have felt myself I know what Garibaldi must have felt. If he refuses me his forgiveness I cannot reproach him for it." Parliament supported Cavour, ratifying the cession by a majority of 229, more than four-fifths of the entire chamber. The plébiscites in Savoy and Nice took place a few days later and resulted in an almost unanimous vote for annexation to France. One result of this annexation of Savoy and Nice was to prove very important for France. It alienated England from Napoleon completely. England did not wish to see her powerful neighbor grow larger. The depth and unfortunate effect of this estrangement Napoleon was to feel fully before many months had passed. Moreover, might not this acceptance of Italian territory involve him in further Italian complications? Was he not morally compromised? That Cavour appreciated the advantage of the situation was shown by his reported remark to the French ambassador, "Now you are our accomplices." What had Cavour in mind for accomplices to do? He did not

Effect upon Napoleon III.

explain the cryptic utterance, but every one knew that he was still far from his cherished goal. Napoleon III would still be very useful. Sophisticated Guizot, then living in retirement, made at about this time an observation: "There are," he said, "two men upon whom the eyes of Europe are fixed, the Emperor Napoleon and M. de Cavour. The game is being played. I back M. de Cavour."

THE CONQUEST OF THE KINGDOM OF NAPLES

Much had been achieved in the eventful year just described, but much remained to be achieved before the unification of Italy should be complete. Venetia, the larger part of the Papal States, and the Kingdom of Naples still stood outside. In the last, however, events now occurred which carried the process a long step forward. Early in 1860 the Sicilians rose in revolt against the despotism of their new king, Francis II. This insurrection created an opportunity for a man already famous but destined to a wonderful exploit and to a memorable service to his country, Giuseppe Garibaldi, already the most famous military leader in Italy, and invested with a half mythical character of invincibility and daring, the result of a very spectacular, romantic career.

The Sicilian Insurrection.

Giuseppe Garibaldi, 1807-1882.

Garibaldi was born at Nice in 1807. He was therefore two years younger than Mazzini and three years older than Cavour. Destined by his parents for the priesthood he preferred the sea, and for many years he lived a roving and adventurous sailor's life. He early joined "Young Italy." His military experience was chiefly in irregular, guerilla fighting. He took part in the unsuccessful insurrection, organized by Mazzini in Savoy in 1834, and as a result was condemned to death. He managed to escape to South America where, for the next fourteen years, he was an exile. He participated in the abundant wars of the South American states with the famous "Italian Legion," which he organized and commanded. Learning of the uprising of 1848 he returned to Italy, though still under the

penalty of death, and immediately thousands flocked to the standard of the "hero of Montevideo" to fight under him against the Austrians. After the failure of that campaign he went, in 1849, to Rome to assume the military defense of the republic. When the city was about to fall he escaped with four thousand troops, intending to attack the Austrian power in Venetia. French and Austrian armies pursued him. He succeeded in evading them, but his army dwindled away rapidly and the chase became so hot that he was forced to escape to the Adriatic. When he landed later, his enemies were immediately in full cry again, hunting him through forests and over mountains as if he were some dangerous game. It was a wonderful exploit, rendered tragic by the death in a farm-house near Ravenna, of his wife Anita, who was his companion in the camp as in the home, and who was as high-spirited, as daring, as courageous as he. Garibaldi finally escaped to America and began once more the life of an exile. But his story, shot through and through with heroism and chivalry and romance, moved the Italian people to unwonted depths of enthusiasm and admiration.

The defense of Rome.

For several years Garibaldi was a wanderer, sailing the seas, commander of a Peruvian bark. For some months, indeed, he was a candle maker on Staten Island, but in 1854 he returned to Italy and settled down as a farmer on the little island of Caprera. But the events of 1859 once more brought him out of his retirement. Again, as a leader of volunteers, he plunged into the war against Austria and immensely increased his reputation. He had become the idol of soldiers and adventurous spirits from one end of Italy to the other. Multitudes were ready to follow in blind confidence wherever he might lead. His name was one to conjure with. There now occurred, in 1860, the most brilliant episode of his career, the Sicilian expedition and the campaign against the Kingdom of Naples. For Garibaldi, the most redoubtable warrior of Italy, whose very name was worth an army, now decided on his own account to go to

Leader of "The Hunters of the Alps."

Determines to go to Sicily.

the aid of the Sicilians who had risen in revolt against their king, Francis II of Naples.

Cavour's dilemma

His determination created a serious problem for Cavour. The Government of Piedmont could not sanction an attack upon the Kingdom of Naples, with which it was at peace, without seeming a ruthless aggressor upon an unoffending state, and without running the risk of a European intervention which might undo all the work thus far accomplished. In Cavour's opinion the newly enlarged kingdom needed time for consolidation before undertaking any further task. On the other hand, if Garibaldi determined to go it would be dangerous to try to prevent him, and yet the result of a successful campaign might make him a rival of Cavour and might be used to checkmate Piedmont. It was imperative that Piedmont should still direct the evolution of Italy toward her future destiny. Cavour could not approve the expedition, and he was not prepared to condemn it. He therefore adopted the plan of secretly conniving at the preparations, at the same time holding Piedmont officially aloof from all connection with it. Thus he could assure the powers that Piedmont had nothing to do with it. If it should fail, he could not be reproached, whereas if successful, he might profit by it. He had need of all his customary wariness in this juncture.

The Expedition of "The Thousand."

On May 5, 1860, the expedition of "The Thousand," the "Red Shirts," embarked from Genoa in two steamers. These were the volunteers, nearly 1,150 men, whom Garibaldi's fame had caused to rush into the new adventure, an adventure that seemed at the moment one of utter folly. The King of Naples had 24,000 troops in Sicily and 100,000 more on the mainland. The odds against success seemed overwhelming. But fortune favored the brave. After a campaign of a few weeks, in which he was several times in great danger, and was only saved by the most reckless fighting, Garibaldi stood master of the island, helped by the Sicilian insurgents, by volunteers who had flocked from the mainland, and by

the incompetency of the commanders of the Neapolitan troops. Audacity had won the victory. He assumed the position of Dictator in Sicily in the name of Victor Emmanuel II (August 5, 1860).

Conquest of the Kingdom of Naples.

Garibaldi now crossed the straits to the mainland determined to conquer the entire Kingdom of Naples (August 19, 1860). The King still had an army of 100,000 men, but it had not even the strength of a frail reed. There was practically no bloodshed. The Neapolitan Kingdom was not overthrown; it collapsed. Treachery, desertion, corruption did the work. On September 6th, Francis II left Naples for Gaeta and the next day Garibaldi entered it by rail with only a few attendants, and drove through the streets amid a pandemonium of enthusiasm. In less than five months he had conquered a kingdom of 11,000,000 people, an achievement unique in modern history.

Garibaldi plans to attack Rome.

Garibaldi now began to talk of pushing on to Rome. To Cavour the situation seemed full of danger. Rome was occupied by a French garrison. An attack upon it would almost necessarily mean an attack upon France. A clash between Garibaldi's followers and the French troops which were maintaining the Pope's power in Rome would probably bring an intervention of Napoleon, this time against the Italians. There must, therefore, be no attack upon Rome. But while Rome itself and its immediate neighborhood must be preserved inviolate for the Pope, Cavour did not think that the two eastern provinces of the Papal States, Umbria and the Marches, need be. They desired annexation to Piedmont and were only kept down by an army of volunteers, drawn from Ireland, Austria, France and other Catholic countries. Ought people who wished to be free from the Pope's rule to be kept in subjection by an army of mercenaries?

Intervention of Piedmont.

Cavour felt that Victor Emmanuel must act. It would not do to leave Garibaldi to act as he wished, for that would mean an attack upon Rome and probably upon Venetia,

and that would range Italy against, not only France, but Austria, two great empires, and everything that had been so painfully accomplished would be imperiled. To prevent Garibaldi's advance which, once under way, would be beyond control, Victor Emmanuel must take charge of the revolution in southern Italy. Yet if Victor Emmanuel's troops entered the Papal States all the Catholic countries of Europe, outraged at the despoiling of the Pope, might intervene and undo what had been already done. Cavour believed that if he left the Pope unmolested in Rome, Napoleon would have no objection to the rest of the Papal States going into the new kingdom, if the population desired it. In this estimate he was correct. Understanding finally that Napoleon approved, if only the thing were done quickly, Victor Emmanuel's army crossed into the Papal States and defeated the Papal troops at Castelfidardo (September 18th, 1860). They then entered the territory of Naples. The climax to all this unification movement was now at hand. On October 11, 1860, Parliament voted overwhelmingly in favor of the annexation of all the provinces in central and southern Italy whose people should declare in favor of it by plébiscite. The plébiscite took place in the Kingdom of Naples on October 21-22, 1860, and was overwhelmingly in favor of annexation. On the mainland approximately 1,300,000 voted yes, 10,000 no; in Sicily 432,000 yes, 600 no. A few days later the Pope's former subjects in the Marches voted for annexation by 133,000 to 1,200; and in Umbria by 97,000 to 380. Majorities so staggering showed how unanimous was the desire for unification.

The annexation of the Kingdom of Naples and of Umbria and the Marches.

After having conquered the Papal army at Castelfidardo, Victor Emmanuel had advanced with his army into the Kingdom of Naples for the double purpose of defeating the army still under Francis II at Capua and Gaeta, which Garibaldi had not been able to conquer, and of taking the direction of affairs of state out of the hands of Garibaldi who, successful in war, was eminently lacking

Le Réveil (lendemain de Solférino 1859) (1).

6
8
St Gothard Pass
10
Longitude East
12 from
SWITZERLAND
Lausanne
Geneva
R. Saône
Rhône R.
Simplon
Lago Maggiore
Lago Como
Trent
Savoy
Aosta
Como
Bergamo
Lombardy
Venetia
Treviso
Chambery
Magenta
Novara
Brescia
Peschiera
Sirmione
Villafranca
Verona
Padua
Mt Cenis
R. Isère
Susa
Turin
Piedmont
MILAN
Pavia
Casale
Mantua
R. Adige
R. Po
Grenoble
Rhône R.
Durance R.
Piacenza
Alessandria
Parma
Reggio
Modena
Ferrara
Romagna
Genoa
Bologna
Cuneo
Gulf of
Genoa
Spezia
Massa
Lucca
Florence
Avignon
Nice
Monaco
Pisa
Arno R.
Arezzo
Leghorn
Tuscany
Marseilles
Toulon
Siena
Cortona
Perugia
C. Corso
Elba
Orbetello
Orvieto
Patrimony
Corsica
Civitavecchia
ROME
Ajaccio
Tyrrhenian
Caprera
G. of Terranova
Sassari
Sardinia
Cagliari
Tunis
Trapani
Marsala
Pantella
MAP TO ILLUSTRATE
THE UNIFICATION OF
ITALY
Scale of English Miles
0 20 40 60 80 100
REFERENCE
I Aquired by Sardinia, by Treaty of Zurich, Nov. 10th 1859.
II Annexation to Sardinia, voted by Plebiscites, Mar. 11, & 12, 1860.
III Annexation to Sardinia, voted by Plebiscites, Nov. 4, & 5, 1860.
IV Annexation to Sardinia, voted by Plebiscites, Oct. 21st, 1860.
V Annexation to Kingdom of Italy, Voted by Plebiscites, Oct. 21, & 22, 1866.
VI Annexation to Kingdom of Italy, Voted by Plebiscite, Oct. 2, 1870.
VII Ceded to France, March, 1860.
VIII Ceded to France, March, 1860.
46
44
42
40
38
6
8
10
12

12
14
16
18
20
46
44
42
40
38
Laibach
Carniola
Agram
Triest
Istria
Fiume
Pola
Save R.
Brod
Belgrade
Croatia
Dalmatia
Zara
Bosna Serai
Sebenico
Spalato
Ancona
Castelfidardo
Lissa
Adriatic Sea
Montenegro
Cetigno
Ragusa
Cattaro
Budua
Scutari
Pescara
Abruzzi
Molise
Foggia
Pontecorvo
Garta
Capua
Caserta
Benevento
Volturno
NAPLES
Nola
Vesuvius
Ischia
Capri
Salerno
Bari
Durazzo
Brindisi
Taranto
Basilicata
Otranto
Avlona
Corfu
Castrovillari
Paola
Cosenza
Calabria
Ionian Sea
Montleone
Nicotera
Messina
Milazzo
Aspromonte
Reggio
Lipari Ids
PALERMO
Termini
Cefalone
Etna
Taormina
Catania
Syracuse
Noto
KINGDOM OF THE TWO SICILIES

EMPEROR FRANCIS JOSEPH OF AUSTRIA

in political sagacity. It was imperative that Victor Emmanuel's authority should be supreme in Naples, that he might control the evolution of events. Both purposes were now achieved. The troops of Francis II were defeated at Capua on the first and second of November, and the siege of Gaeta, where Francis took his last stand, began.

Siege of Gaeta.

Garibaldi had demanded the resignation of Cavour from Victor Emmanuel and seemed disposed to insist upon certain conditions before handing over his conquest to him. The King's attitude was firm. He declined to consider the dismissal of Cavour. Moreover, now that Victor Emmanuel was himself in the Kingdom of Naples with a large army, and was backed by the vote of the Parliament and the plébiscites favoring annexation, Garibaldi yielded. On November 7th, Victor Emmanuel and Garibaldi drove together through the streets of Naples. The latter refused all rewards and honors and with only a little money and a bag of seed beans for his farm he sailed away to Caprera. Gaeta fell on February 13, 1861, and the King fled to Rome, entering upon a life of exile which was to end only with his death in 1894.

On the 18th of February, 1861, a new Parliament, representing all Italy except Venetia and Rome, met in Turin. The Kingdom of Sardinia now gave way to the Kingdom of Italy, proclaimed March 17th. Victor Emmanuel II was declared "by the grace of God and the will of the nation, King of Italy."

The Kingdom of Italy proclaimed.

A new kingdom, comprising a population of about twenty-two millions, had arisen during a period of eighteen months, and now took its place among the powers of Europe. The Pope refused to recognize this "creation of revolution," and excommunicated the criminal invaders of his states. Victor Emmanuel he denounced as "forgetful of every religious principle, despising every right, trampling upon every law." Against his assumption of the title of King of Italy,

with which he has sought to seal his "sacrilegious usurpations," Pius IX formally protested.[1]

The kingdom still incomplete.

But the Kingdom of Italy was still incomplete. Venetia was still Austrian and the Patrimony of St. Peter was still subject to the Pope. This was a strip along the western coast, between Tuscany and Naples, twenty or thirty miles wide, and included the incomparable city of Rome. The Pope's power rested on the French garrison. The new Kingdom, however, was not strong enough to take Venetia from Austria, nor disposed to defy the Emperor Napoleon by an attack upon Rome.

The question of Rome.

There were, indeed, some Italian nationalists who were willing to forego permanently the possession of Rome as the capital. D'Azeglio called the desire for it simply "a classical fantasticality." Moreover, it was "a malarial town fit only for a museum." Not so thought Cavour, who believed that "without Rome there was no Italy." He declared that now that national independence had been secured the great object must be "to make the Eternal City, on which rest twenty-five centuries of glory, the splendid capital of the Italian Kingdom." The position of the capital was not to be determined by the character of the climate or topography, but by moral reasons and the moral primacy of Rome among all Italian cities was unquestionable. They must have Rome, but on two conditions, that France should consent and that the Catholic world should have no just ground to believe that it meant the subjection of the Pope. Cavour hoped that the Pope would be willing to give up his temporal power on the guarantee that his spiritual authority should be carefully guarded and even extended. The principle of "a free church in a free state" absorbed his thought at this time. At his request Parliament voted the principle that Rome should be the capital of Italy, a solemn official declaration from which there could be no retreat. This was Cavour's last great act, for he

[1] Robinson and Beard, Readings in Modern European History, II, 130.

now fell ill. Overwork, the extraordinary pressure under which he had for months been laboring, brought on insomnia; finally fever developed and he died on the morning of June 6th, 1861, in the very prime of life, for he was only fifty-one years of age.

Death of Cavour.

"Cavour," said Lord Palmerston, in the British House of Commons, "left a name 'to point a moral and adorn a tale.' The moral was, that a man of transcendent talent, indomitable industry, inextinguishable patriotism, could overcome difficulties which seemed insurmountable, and confer the greatest, the most inestimable benefits on his country. The tale with which his memory would be associated was the most extraordinary, the most romantic, in the annals of the world. A people who had seemed dead had arisen to new and vigorous life, breaking the spell which bound it, and showing itself worthy of a new and splendid destiny." [1]

Throughout his life Cavour remained faithful to his fundamental political principle, government by parliament and by constitutional forms. Urged at various times to assume a dictatorship he said he had no confidence in dictatorships. "I always feel strongest," he said, "when Parliament is sitting." "I cannot betray my origin, deny the principles of all my life," he wrote in a private letter not intended for the public. "I am the son of liberty and to her I owe all that I am. If a veil is to be placed on her statue, it is not for me to do it."

[1] Quoted by Cesaresco: Cavour, 216.

CHAPTER XI

BISMARCK AND GERMAN UNITY

Reaction in Germany after 1849.

In 1848 and 1849 the reformers of Germany, as of other countries, had made a vigorous effort to effect profound alterations in the political and social institutions of their country. Momentarily successful, their day of power proved brief, and by 1850 the old authorities were once more solidly established in their old positions. A practical absolutism reigned again throughout most of central Europe. In place of the German unity so long desired and for which the Frankfort Parliament had struggled with such earnest futility, the old Diet of 1815, slow, cumbrous, impotent save for repression, quietly slipped back into the familiar, well-worn grooves, resuming its sessions in May 1851, and devoting its attention to the removal of the débris left by the revolutionary hurricane which had just swept by. A period of reaction began again, even more far-reaching in its scope than that which had followed the Congress of Vienna of 1815. This period may be considered to have lasted from the diplomatic defeat of Prussia at Olmütz in 1850 to 1858, when William I assumed the Regency of Prussia, and to 1859 when Austria, now as formerly the strong tower of ultra-conservatism, suffered an important diminution of power and prestige in the military defeats in Italy which have been described above.

During this period the work of 1848 and 1849 was undone wherever possible, and a persecution of Liberals carried out so thoroughly that tens of thousands left the country. This inspired some alarm at first, but consolation was found in the thought that the removal of these disturbers of the public mind would only leave the fatherland politically in

peace. This was the beginning of the large German emigration to the United States, which has since attained such impressive proportions and been attended by such important consequences. Austria and Prussia took the lead in the familiar work of repression.

Prussia a constitutional but not a parliamentary state.

The King of Prussia, Frederick William IV, had, as we have seen, granted a Constitution and created a Parliament during the recent convulsion, but it quickly became evident that he had no intention of establishing the parliamentary system as it had been developed in England. He did not for a moment propose to weaken the royal power by dividing it with any assembly, even with one which, like this, represented only the rich. No new taxes or laws might be passed without the consent of the new chamber, but old ones might be continued without that consent. The Chamber had no control whatever over the ministry. With machinery like this Parliament could not have prevented reaction even had it so desired; but constituted as it was, it became itself one of the instruments of reaction.

That reaction began at once. The King was urged to abolish the Constitution outright, but this, mindful of his oath, he never did. However, a method of "interpreting" it virtually achieved the same end. The ministers gained great skill in the art of ruling with the Constitution against the Constitution. Laws which they disapproved were simply not executed or their contents were by "interpretation" molded to the heart's desire. The Constitution had proclaimed the right of association and public meeting, but as a matter of fact this right was permitted only to those favorable to the Government. Public meetings were watched by agents of the Government, who, on the least pretext, might dissolve them. Everywhere the police were active and unscrupulous. Arbitrary arrest and imprisonment were frequent. A Berlin police regulation in 1851 permitted the application to prisoners of torture, deprivation of light, the strait-jacket, and corporal punishment up to forty

The police system.

strokes. Men who were supposed to be democrats were hounded in every way. "No lawyer would give me work," wrote one of them; "no business man had the courage to seek the aid of my legal knowledge; no editor would consent to publish a book of mine." With great difficulty he succeeded in bringing out three novels. At once the Government forbade their introduction into public libraries, forbade their sale. Certain physicians were denied the certificates necessary to the practice of their profession because, as democrats, their "morality" could not be guaranteed. Abuses of power succeeded each other rapidly. "God in Heaven," wrote Bunsen, "what a frightful situation for Germany!" The mails were not respected. Postmen were ordered not to deliver letters to Liberals. Even reactionaries themselves felt the pinch at times. "I cannot write you much about politics," Bismarck informed his wife, "for all letters are opened." And again, "Do not forget, when you write me, that your letters are not read simply by myself but are also read at the post office, by spies of every feather; be, without exception, prudent in your remarks."

The censorship abolished by the Constitution was not restored, but the same end was otherwise achieved. Methods were followed in this respect, as in many others, which were copied from Napoleon III, who was applying them successfully in France. Much ingenious reasoning was displayed at times by government officials. In one case the police announced that the law permitted the publication of newspapers but not their sale, and thus one Liberal paper was suppressed. By such means virtual absolutism was restored in Prussia after the liberal awakening of 1848 and 1849. No relief was found in the Chamber, for the Government secured large and dependent majorities there, by the same methods which Napoleon III used in France, by official candidacies and by various forms of bribery and intimidation. The system was thoroughly established. Prussia,

Control of the press.

with a Constitution, was really ruled without regard to its provisions.

The privileged class.

The governing forces were the King and the landed nobility. These were the "Junkers," whom Bismarck later called the "pariahs of modern civilization," hide-bound conservatives, completely dominated by the ideas of old-time feudalism. The House of Lords was now one of their seats of power. Indignant at the former freeing of their serfs they labored with much success to regain old rights, such as the police power on their estates, and hunting privileges. They had a monopoly of the higher grades in the army. All these measures irritated various classes of society and unrest, not peace, was the ominous result. No wonder that Bernhardi exclaimed, "The Constitution is nothing but a name," and that another who lived through it all wrote a little later, "The period from 1849 to 1858 was the most shameful in the history of Prussia."

But signs were not lacking of the dawning of a new day. The economic evolution of the country was proceeding on the whole unimpeded and quietly, and that evolution tended directly toward liberty, for it meant the transformation of Germany from an agricultural, feudal, and patriarchal into a great industrial nation. Even the Government itself facilitated this transformation which was in the end to be so prejudicial to its system, imitating in this, as in so many other respects, the example of Napoleon III, who thought that the best way to make people forget their loss of liberty was to enable them to get rich. But in the main this transformation was effected, not by governmental measures, but by the unseen, unconscious operation of the ordinary laws of business.

Economic transformation.

This economic transformation is the most important feature of German history in the decade from 1850 to 1860, for it began the creation of that industrial Germany which is so tremendous a fact in the world of to-day. This transformation was apparent in many ways. Rich deposits of gold

had been discovered in California in 1848, and in Australia in 1851. It has been estimated that the world's production of the precious metal was about four times as great in 1856 as in 1847. The increase in the quantity of the medium of exchange had, among other important results, for Germany this, the sudden creation of a large number of banks and business corporations. In Bavaria, for instance, only six stock companies with a capital of five millions had been founded between 1839 and 1848; but from 1849 to 1858 forty-four were established with a capital of one hundred and seventy millions. The capital of the banks created in Germany from 1853 to 1857 aggregated about 750 millions. All this meant an immense increase in the resources available for industry.

Industrial development.

Germany had for various reasons remained industrially far behind neighboring countries, particularly France and England. Her population was largely rural, two-thirds of her inhabitants were agriculturalists. Whatever industries existed were small. There were very few large cities. Berlin, the capital of Prussia, had a population of about 450,000, and in the entire Confederation there were only six or seven cities of more than 100,000 inhabitants. Both exports and imports were few. Germany sold little but raw materials. All this was rapidly changed. Capital being easily procured, hundreds of new enterprises were started. Particularly was the exploitation of the immense mineral resources of the country, thus far largely neglected, undertaken with great energy. Coal mines were opened up, factories and foundries arose on all sides. Alfred Krupp made the steel foundry, begun by his father in 1810, one of the most famous establishments of the kind in the world. Workmen, attracted by higher wages than could be procured in agriculture, flocked to the cities, which increased rapidly. Economists state that the period of speculation succeeding the revolution of 1848 was the most remarkable Germany has ever seen. The Germans took naturally to modern business, showing their usual

qualities of patience, order, adaptability, and an abounding faith in the advantages to be derived from the application to economic life of the discoveries of science and from the use of scientific methods. The mileage of railroads rapidly increased, in Prussia alone in a few years from 114 miles to over 800, and the number of travelers increased fourfold.

Rise of a wealthy middle class.

All this had important political and intellectual consequences. It meant the rise of a modern capitalist class, a rich bourgeoisie, which would insist and which would have the power to insist that the state should no longer be run along medieval lines for the benefit of a feudal monarchy, and a feudal nobility of landlords. And the result of this economic revolution was to broaden men's horizon, and to weaken the local states-rights feeling. Manufacturers and merchants were anxious for the widest market, and impatient of laws and institutions that hindered business. They saw the inconveniences that flowed from the existing political organization of Germany, the petty state animosities and the powerlessness of the Confederation abroad. They wished a reorganization of the country so that Germany should have the weight in international affairs that was necessary for the development of her wealth. That they might compete in the world markets they must have the support of the Government. The Government of the Confederation was impotent. This growing class therefore would hail with enthusiasm any attempt to strengthen it. Thus business was undermining the established order in politics. The requirements of modern industrialism were potent factors in the ultimate creation of German unity.

Intellectual activity.

At the same time a similar trend was unmistakable in the intellectual evolution of Germany, and was shown in the various fields of theology, science, history and literature. From the romantic, the metaphysical, the speculative people they had been, Germans were becoming practical, positive, realist. The boldest innovations in the economic life were matched by the boldest discoveries in science. A

new heaven and a new earth were taking the place of the old. The German intellect was showing its enterprise, its daring in every line, and was heaping up great riches. An intellectual environment was being created in which the great realist of the century in Germany could breathe and work successfully. It would be difficult to show all this except at length, and this would be impossible in the present treatise. But the fact remains that Schopenhauer in philosophy, and Helmholtz and Virchow in science, were laying intellectual foundations for the unification of Germany and the hegemony of Prussia.[1] The historians of the period, Sybel, Treitschke, Droysen, Freytag, produced histories in abundance which were really great patriotic pamphlets, therefore less valuable as histories than as organs for shaping public opinion toward great and decisive action in the field of politics. They were vigorously patriotic, nationalistic in tone, Prussian in sympathy. Even Mommsen and Curtius, who wrote in the field of ancient history, distinctly revealed the current preconceptions and aspirations of the day.[2]

Influence of events in Italy upon German thought.

Opinion in Germany was greatly stimulated by the events in Italy. The Italian war of 1859, and the formation of the Italian Kingdom exerted a remarkable influence upon events outside of the peninsula. Here was a successful application of the doctrine of nationalities. Might not the precedent receive wider application? Poland, Denmark, Germany felt a powerful impulsion from beyond the Alps. This influence was shown in the very month of Villafranca.

The National Union.

For July 1859 saw the genesis in Hanover of a new patriotic society, called the National Union, whose purpose was to create a national party for the purpose of "achieving the unity of the fatherland and the development of its liberties." The society soon spread throughout Germany. Unity and liberty were its watchwords. Did not the Italian

[1] Denis, La Fondation de l'Empire Allemand, Chap. III.
[2] Guilland, L'Allemagne Nouvelle et ses Historiens.

campaign prove the necessity of the former? If Napoleon III could invade Italy, might he not with equal ease invade Germany? There must be a thorough military reorganization so that Germany should be safe from possible aggression, and to accomplish this the Confederation, as a whole, must first be reorganized. Cavour was, in the opinion of the members of the National Union, the model whom German statesmen should imitate. Prussia ought to do for Germany what Piedmont had done for Italy. Let her become frankly liberal, then Liberals everywhere would support her, and she could make the fatherland. This was not the method followed, as we shall see. Germany was made by an autocratic not by a liberal government. And the reason was that the conservative class was stronger in Germany than in Italy, and happened to find two able leaders, William I and Bismarck, as the Liberals in Italy had found two of their kind, Victor Emmanuel and Cavour. Though the National Liberals in Germany influenced public opinion extensively and thus facilitated in the end the rise of German unity, they clashed with those who actually carried out the work, and were themselves defeated. The achievement of German unity was to be no imitation of an Italian example.

The full import of all these changes in the economic life and in the intellectual outlook, this fermentation of ideas, was shortly to be shown in the reign, destined to prove most illustrious, of William I of Prussia. The preliminary stage was over, the period of action was about to begin.

William I, 1797-1888.

In 1857, Frederick William IV became, by reason of mental disease, incapable of administering the Government. As the King had no son, his brother, William I, became his representative. The following year William became Regent, which gave him complete independence of action. It was recognized that the King would never recover. He died in January 1861, and William became sovereign. The accession of the new prince was hailed with great enthusiasm, so deep and

general had been the disappointment in Prussia over the timidity, the reactionary character, and the fruitlessness of his predecessor's rule. The new ruler was intellectually the very antipodes of his brother, slow, solid, persistent, firm, rather than brilliant and imaginative. Common sense was his strongest quality as versatility had been that of his brother. William was the son of the famous Queen Louise, was born in 1797, and had served in the campaign against Napoleon in 1814. He was now over sixty years of age. His entire lifetime had been spent in the army, which he loved passionately. In military matters his thorough knowledge and competence were recognized. He had resented deeply the action of his brother at Olmütz, action dictated by the military weakness of Prussia. William believed that Prussia's destiny depended upon her army. The army was necessary for his purpose, which was to put Prussia at the head of Germany. "Now," he had written in 1849, "whoever wishes to rule Germany must conquer it; and that cannot be done with phrases." The mobilization of the Prussian troops in 1859 convinced him more than ever that the army needed strengthening. He now brought forward a definite military programme.

The Prussian army.

Prussia had been the first state, and was thus far the only one, to adopt the principle that all male citizens must be soldiers. By the law of 1814 universal compulsory three years' service in the active army was established. The soldier then passed into the reserve for two years, which meant that he would be summoned to military exercise for several weeks each year; he then passed into the *landwehr* for several years (from the ages of twenty-six to thirty-nine), receiving some little training intermittently. Then he passed into the *landsturm*, where he remained until the age of fifty, to be called out only in the case of direst necessity. This system had been in existence for forty-six years, with only slight modification. But the system had not, in practice, been thoroughly carried out. No account had been

taken of the increase of population. In 1820 the population of Prussia was about 12,000,000. The number of yearly recruits had been fixed at 40,000 and regiments for that number had been established. But in 1860 the population was about 18,000,000, and if all able-bodied men of military age were recruited, as by law they should be, there would be 63,000. As a matter of fact, however, the number of recruits had been kept at 40,000, which meant that many thousand young men, by law required to serve three years under the colors, had been excused in practice from service, and that others had been required to serve only two years. This kept the army down to about 130,000 active soldiers on a peace footing, 215,000 in time of war.

The obligatory service not enforced.

William I believed such a condition full of danger for Prussia. Considering himself primarily a soldier, the first soldier of Prussia, and responsible for her defense, he resolved to carry through certain reforms. In 1859 he appointed Albrecht von Roon Minister of War, in politics a convinced reactionary, in military matters a man of great knowledge and ability. In 1860 a plan for the reform of the army was submitted to the Prussian Parliament. Henceforth the law requiring universal military service was to be rigorously enforced.

Army reform.

This would mean 63,000 recruits each year instead of 40,000, and would give an army of 190,000 in time of peace, 450,000 in time of war, the service in the reserve being lengthened from two to four years. Thus the military forces of Prussia would be doubled. To do this necessitated the creation of new regiments with their officers and colors. This would involve an increase in the budget, which could only be sanctioned by Parliament. But the Chamber of Deputies was from the beginning opposed to this change, though it voted appropriations once on the understanding that they were provisional only. The Government acted as if they were permanent. In 1862 the Chamber refused the moneys entirely. This meant that the new regi-

Opposition of the Chamber.

ments must be disbanded, their officers dismissed, that what had been done must be undone, that the royal plan of army reform must be abandoned, although it had been put into force at least provisionally, that the Government must, in a most conspicuous matter, retrace its steps. Over this question a bitter and prolonged controversy arose between the Crown and the Chamber of Deputies, each side growing stiffer as the contest proceeded. The King was absolutely resolved not to abate one jot from his demands. He believed that the organization of the army, and the system of national defense belonged exclusively to himself, as they had undoubtedly to previous Prussian kings; that the fact that in 1850 a Constitution had come into existence creating a Parliament in no respect altered the situation; that indeed the right had been expressly confirmed by that Constitution; that Parliament was in duty bound to vote all appropriations necessary for him to discharge his duties as supreme executive and commander-in-chief. Parliament, on the other hand, held that by the Constitution all grants must be voted by it, that if it were bound to vote them on the mere demand of the King its discretion and power would simply disappear entirely. Parliament must, in the interests of the people, insist upon the preservation intact of its delegated powers, and the control of the purse was the chief of these. A deadlock ensued. The King was urged to abolish Parliament altogether. This he would not do because he had sworn to support the Constitution which established it. He thought of abdicating. He never thought of abandoning the reform. He had written out his abdication and signed it, and it was lying upon his desk when he at last consented to call to the ministry as a final experiment a new man, known for his boldness, his independence, his devotion to the monarchy, Otto von Bismarck. Bismarck was appointed President of the Ministry September 23, 1862: on that very day the Chamber rejected anew the credits asked for by the King for the new regiments.

Determination of William I.

Otto von Bismarck-Schönhausen, 1815-1898.

The conflict entered upon its most acute phase and a new era began for Prussia and for the world.

In this interview Bismarck told the King frankly that he was willing to carry out his policy whether the Parliament agreed to it or not. "I will rather perish with the King," he said, "than forsake your Majesty in the contest with parliamentary government." His boldness determined the King to tear up the paper containing his abdication and to continue the struggle with the Chamber of Deputies.

Bismarck's previous career.

The man who now entered upon the stage of European politics was one of the most original and salient characters of his century. Born in 1815, he came of a noble family in Brandenburg, and as a young man seemed completely imbued with all the narrowness of his order, its vigorous insistence upon the preservation of existing institutions, its tenacious adherence to forms of belief that had long been undermined in Europe. Receiving a university education, he entered the civil service of Prussia only shortly to turn from its monotonous routine with invincible disgust. He then settled upon his father's estate as a country squire. For years he gave himself up to the problem of retrieving the family fortune, and with ultimate success. In 1847 he emerged from his country life and began his political career as a member of the United Diet. He now had an opportunity to expound his political views, which he did with emphasis. No compromise with the Revolution was his watchword. More royalist than the King he resented the King's act of granting a Constitution to Prussia but, once granted, he would abide by it. But he had no notion that the Constitution should transform Prussia into a state like England, the model which Liberals were constantly urging other people to follow. "The references to England are our misfortune," he said. If Prussians were only Englishmen, and possessed all the institutions and qualities of Englishmen, then "you might govern us in the English fashion." Bismarck's political ideas centered in his ardent belief in

Bismarck's political opinions.

the Prussian monarchy. It had been the Prussian kings, not the Prussian people, who had made Prussia great. This, the great historic fact, must be preserved. What Prussian kings had done, they still would do. A reduction of royal power would only be damaging to the state. "The Prussian Crown must not allow itself," he said, "to be thrust into the powerless position of the English Crown, which seems more like a smartly decorative cupola on the state edifice, than its central pillar of support, as I consider ours." When the democrats declared that England had been made great by democracy he flatly contradicted them. England had grown great under an aristocratic constitution. "It remains to be seen whether this reformed constitution (1832) will maintain itself for centuries as did the earlier rule of the English aristocracy." He defended vehemently the Prussian nobility, a class at that time bitterly attacked. By them, and by their blood, the Prussian state had been built up. Bismarck was the uncompromising foe of the attempts made in 1848 to achieve German unity, because he believed those attempts involved a diminution in the importance of Prussia, and he was above all a Prussian. "The Frankfort crown may be very brilliant," he said, "but the gold which would give truth to its brilliancy can only be gained by melting down the Prussian crown," something he could not contemplate without horror. "The scheme for a union annihilates the integrity of the Prussian kingdom . . . Prussians we are and Prussians we will remain." His attitude toward the assembly, of which he was a member, is shown by the words, "I know that what I have said to you will have no influence on your votes, but I am equally convinced that your votes will be as completely without influence on the course of events." No European state had suffered a more complete humiliation than Prussia at Olmütz, yet Bismarck vigorously defended the action of the Government. "Prussia ought to unite with Austria in order to crush the common enemy,

His attitude toward parliamentary institutions.

the Revolution." "I regard Austria as the representative and inheritor of an ancient German power which has often gloriously wielded the German sword." The reason for this defense of Olmütz is highly significant. "The only sound principle of action for a great state is political egoism, and not romanticism, and it is unworthy of such a state to strive for anything which does not directly concern it."[1] A war with Austria in 1850 would have meant the ruin of Prussia. Therefore egoism, the sole legitimate motive force in politics, justified the convention of Olmütz. "According to my conviction," he said in a speech which he incorporated in part more than forty years later in his *Reminiscences*, "Prussian honor does not consist in Prussia's playing the Don Quixote all over Germany for the benefit of mortified parliament celebrities who consider their local constitution in danger. I look for Prussian honor in Prussia's abstinence before all things from every shameful union with democracy; in Prussia's refusal to allow, in the present and all other questions, anything to happen in Germany without her consent; and in the joint execution by the two protecting powers of Germany, with equal authority, of whatsoever they, Prussia and Austria, after joint independent deliberation, consider reasonable and politically justifiable."

His hatred of democracy.

By such utterances, poorly delivered, for he was no orator, Bismarck made himself immensely disliked by all Liberals. On the other hand, such downright and uncompromising flouting of all the popular phrases of the day, such unqualified and defiant adherence to monarchy and aristocracy commended him to the King, who appointed him, in 1851, Prussian delegate to the Diet at Frankfort. Bismarck's career now broadened, and during the next eight years he studied and practised the art of diplomacy, in

[1] Bismarck's political principles may be best studied in the speeches which he delivered during the years 1847-1851, and which may be found in Kohl, Die politischen Reden des Fürsten Bismarck, Vol. I. Particularly interesting are the speeches of September 24, 1849, and December 3, 1850.

which he was later to win many sweeping victories. He made the acquaintance of all the important statesmen and politicians of Germany and studied their characters and ambitions.

Bismarck in the Diet.

He had not been long in Frankfort before his views in regard to Austria changed. He came to regard her as the constant and determined enemy of Prussia, and to believe that her policy was to reduce Prussia to the position of a mere satellite, and Bismarck had no notion that a nation of 17,000,000 should occupy that position. At once this jingo Prussian bent all his energies to convince his superiors in Berlin of this fact. He soon saw that, though bound together in the same federation, the harmony of the two great German powers had been destroyed by the events of 1848. As early as 1853 he said in a report to Berlin that there was not room in Germany for the two powers—that one or the other must bend. Three years later he expressed his opinion even more clearly, "I only desire to express my conviction that ere long we shall have to fight Austria for our very existence; it is not in our power to avert that eventuality, for the course of events in Germany can lead to no other result." [1] In 1859, as he was leaving the Diet for the mission to St. Petersburg, he summed up the situation, "I see in our federal alliance that Prussia has an infirmity which sooner or later we shall have to heal *ferro et igni,* unless we begin in good time to seek a remedy for it." "Bismarck," wrote the Austrian delegate at the Diet, "believes that Prussia forms the center of the world." He did so regard it, and his activity largely made it so for others.

Such was the man, who in 1862 at the age of forty-seven, accepted the position of President of the Prussian Ministry at a time when King and Parliament confronted each other in angry deadlock, and when no other politician would accept the leadership. For four years, from 1862 to 1866, the

[1] Quoted by Murdock, The Reconstruction of Europe, 190.

conflict continued. The Constitution was not abolished, Parliament was called repeatedly, the Lower House voted year after year against the budget, supported in this by the voters, the Upper House voted for it, and the King acted as if this made it legal. The period was one of virtual dictatorship and real suspension of parliamentary life. The King continued to collect the taxes, the army was thoroughly reorganized and absolutely controlled by the authorities, and the Lower House had no mode of opposition save the verbal one, which was entirely ineffective.

The period of conflict.

Thus the increase in the army was secured. But an army is a mere means to an end. The particular end that Bismarck had in view was the creation of German unity by means of Prussia and for the advantage of Prussia. There must be no absorption of Prussia in Germany, as there had been of Piedmont in Italy, Piedmont as a separate state entirely disappearing. And in Bismarck's opinion this unity could only be achieved by war.

Army reform carried through.

He boldly denied in Parliament the favorite theory of the Liberals, that Prussia was to be made great by a liberal, free, parliamentary government, by setting an example of progressiveness, as Piedmont had done, which would rally Germans in other states about her, rather than about their own governments. In what was destined to be the most famous speech of his life he declared in 1863 that what Germans cared about was not the liberalism of Prussia but her power. Prussia must concentrate her forces and hold herself ready for the favorable moment. The boundaries of the kingdom, as determined by the Congress of Vienna, were not favorable to a sound political life. "Not by speeches and majority votes are the great questions of the day decided—that was the great blunder of 1848 and 1849—but by blood and iron."

This "blood and iron" policy was bitterly denounced by Liberals, but Bismarck ignored their criticisms and shortly found a chance to begin its application. Displaying re-

"Blood and iron" policy.

markable diplomatic astuteness and subtlety, unfolding surprising resourcefulness in using the exceedingly complicated international relations of his day in such a way as to further his Prussian and German plans, he proceeded to reshape Europe in most important particulars. He was favored in this by the jealousies of the powers and the general incompetence of their ministers. It was fortunate for Prussia that at a time when it was directed by one of the geniuses of the century, other countries were directed by mediocrities. His own ability, great as it was, would not alone have sufficed to accomplish the work of the next few years.

Prussia's three wars.

The German Empire is the result of the policy of blood and iron as carried out by Prussia in three wars which were crowded into the brief period of six years, the war with Denmark in 1864, with Austria in 1866, and with France in 1870, the last two of which were largely the result of his will and his diplomatic ingenuity and unscrupulousness, and the first of which he exploited consummately for the advantage of Prussia.

The Schleswig-Holstein question.

The first of these grew out of one of the most complicated questions that have ever perplexed diplomatists and statesmen, the future of Schleswig and Holstein. These were two duchies in the Danish peninsula, which is itself simply an extension of the great plain of northern Germany. Holstein was inhabited by a population of about 600,000, entirely German; Schleswig by a population of from 250,000 to 300,000 Germans and 150,000 Danes. These two duchies had for centuries been united with Denmark, but they did not form an integral part of the Danish kingdom. Their relation to Denmark was personal, arising from the fact that a Duke of Schleswig and Holstein had become King of Denmark, just as an Elector of Hanover had become a King of England. The King of Denmark was in the duchies simply duke. The Danes naturally wished to make this union a real one, to incorporate entirely the duchies with the king-

dom. But there were plain obstacles in the way. Holstein (not Schleswig) was a part of the German Confederation; the King of Denmark as Duke of Holstein was represented in the Diet of Frankfort, as were the King of Prussia and the Emperor of Austria. Now the Germans in Schleswig wished to have that duchy also a part of the German Confederation, and were warmly supported in this desire by the public opinion of Germans everywhere. On the other hand, the Danes of Schleswig wished to have the duchy annexed to Denmark, and were naturally supported in this by the Danes of that kingdom.

Action of Denmark concerning Schleswig.

The question had long been before Europe, but in 1863 it became acute, when on November 13, 1863, the Danish Parliament adopted a new Constitution, which incorporated Schleswig with Denmark. Two days later the king, Frederick VII, died, but his successor, Christian IX, signed the Constitution. What would Germany do? Would it allow Germans to be annexed to a foreign country outright? The Diet at once protested, and ordered an army sent into the duchies to prevent this consummation, and in doing this it had the enthusiastic support of public opinion throughout Germany. Bismarck, however, declined to join in this policy. He saw in the situation a chance for the eventual aggrandizement of Prussia, and for a possible future quarrel with Austria. He, therefore, wished Prussia to follow an independent line. He urged Austria to join with Prussia in upholding the London Protocol of 1852, which both powers had signed, as had the other powers of Europe, a treaty which regulated the succession to the duchies, under certain conditions, the main condition being that Christian might be King of Denmark and Duke of Schleswig, but that the duchy should preserve its separateness from Denmark.

Bismarck's handling of the question.

Bismarck's position was that Austria and Prussia had a right to demand the observance of the treaty which they had signed, and that they would support Christian if he would live up to the conditions. He induced Austria to join

him in supporting this Treaty of London, claiming that they were simply upholding the sacredness of international agreements. The two powers proclaimed their intention to adhere to that treaty, but demanded that the Danes withdraw the recent Constitution, which they declared was in defiance of it. The duplicity of Bismarck's policy lay in the fact that he had assured himself that the Danes would not make this concession, which, moreover, he did not wish them to make, as his whole purpose was to pick a quarrel from which Prussia might profit. To make assurance doubly sure, the ultimatum presented to Denmark demanded the withdrawal within forty-eight hours of the Constitution incorporating Schleswig. This, as a matter of fact, was impossible, even if the Danes had unanimously desired it. The King could not do this of his own prerogative: he must have the assent of his Parliament. His Parliament had been dissolved and a new one had not been elected. Naturally, this could not be done in two days. At the expiration of that time Prussia and Austria declared war against Denmark in the name of the Treaty of London of 1852. But Bismarck knew that a war between two countries abrogates existing treaties between them, a fact which he was prepared to utilize to Prussia's advantage in time. In the name of the Treaty of 1852 he made war against Denmark for the real purpose of breaking that very treaty.

Prussia and Austria at war with Denmark.

A war between one small state and two large ones could not be doubtful. Sixty thousand Prussians and Austrians invaded Denmark in February 1864, and, though their campaign was not brilliant, they easily won. The only danger was in a European intervention. A conference was held in London for the purpose of arranging a settlement by diplomacy. But nothing was accomplished. Russia was grateful for Prussian aid in the recent Polish insurrection; France and England were full of reproaches for each other. In such troubled waters Bismarck could fish successfully. He was able to block the proposed intervention. The war was

successful for Prussia and Austria, and Denmark on October 30, 1864, signed the Treaty of Vienna, whereby she renounced all rights to Schleswig, Holstein, and the little duchy of Lauenburg, contiguous to the latter, in favor of Austria and Prussia, and agreed to recognize any disposition they should make concerning them. Bismarck later regarded his handling of the Schleswig-Holstein matter as the diplomatic masterpiece of his career.

Treaty of Vienna, Oct. 1864.

The question now was what should be the future of the duchies? Their inhabitants wished to form a separate state under the Duke of Augustenburg and be admitted as such to the German Confederation. The people of Germany were overwhelmingly in favor of this arrangement, and Austria favored it. But Bismarck's ideas were very different. He did not care for another German state. There were too many already, and this one would only be another enemy of Prussia and ally of Austria. Moreover, Bismarck wished to annex the duchies wholly or in part to Prussia. He desired aggrandizement in general, but this particular addition would be especially advantageous, as it would lengthen the coast line of Prussia, would bring with it several good harbors, notably Kiel, and would enable Prussia to expand commercially. Thus the two powers were at variance over the disposition of their spoils. Bismarck, recognizing the impossibility of gaining his end directly, agreed to recognize the rights of Augustenburg on certain conditions, which he knew Augustenburg would never accept. Prussia and Austria thus differed from the outset as to the future of Schleswig and Holstein. Sources of friction were so numerous, tension became so great, that war between them seemed imminent in 1865. But Austria did not feel in condition for war, and, though Bismarck favored it, the King of Prussia opposed it. He was not yet prepared for a fratricidal contest which did violence to his patriotic and national feelings. Consequently, the Convention of Gastein was made by the two parties

The future of the duchies.

Friction between Prussia and Austria.

August 14, 1865. Joint rule was given up in practice, though not in principle. The duchies belonged to the two powers, but henceforth Austria alone should administer Holstein and Prussia Schleswig. Lauenburg was sold outright to Prussia by Austria for two and a half million thalers. This was the first of Prussian annexations. The treaty also signified a virtual abandonment of the Duke of Augustenburg.

Prussia acquires Lauenburg by purchase.

Bismarck approved the Treaty of Gastein, because, in his opinion, it ended nothing. He called it a mere "stopping of cracks." He regarded it simply as a new trick in the game with Austria. That the Convention was universally denounced abroad and in Germany as merely cold-blooded bargaining was a matter of indifference to him. Out of the situation which it created he hoped to bring about the war with Austria, which he had desired for the past ten years as being the only means whereby German unity could be achieved by Prussia and for its advantage. In this he was successful within a year. There was not room in Germany, he thought, for both powers, "one or the other must bend." He now directed his attention to the creation of an international situation which would leave Austria isolated in the event of a conflict. He turned to diplomacy, and the result was an interview with Napoleon III, and an alliance with Italy. The attitude of France he regarded as most important. Consequently, he took occasion to seek a conference with Napoleon III at Biarritz. The meeting at Biarritz (Oct. 1865) has been considered, though incorrectly, to have had somewhat the same importance in German history that that of Plombières has in Italian. What passed we know only imperfectly. No formal, written engagements were made. Bismarck returned with the conviction that Napoleon would remain neutral in case of a war between Prussia and Austria, that the annexation of Schleswig and Holstein would call forth no opposition from him, that he would even view it with favor as being in harmony with

The meeting at Biarritz.

his favorite doctrine of nationalities. Bismarck told the Emperor that the constitution of the German Confederation ought to be completely reformed. Napoleon seems to have entered no protest. Bismarck, holding that statesmanship is simply enlightened egoism, believed that in return for permission to make these changes France must be paid. Consequently, he dangled before the Emperor chances of enlarging the boundaries of France, but all this was very vague, though quite friendly, and resulted in no precise agreements.

Treaty of alliance with Italy.

Bismarck sought a treaty of alliance with Italy for the coming encounter. Italy coveted Venetia, and in April 1866, after much diplomatic manœuvering, arising from the fact that neither power had confidence in the honesty of the other, a treaty was made and signed on April 8, 1866. It was to the effect that if Prussia should within three months go to war with Austria for the sake of reforms in the German Confederation, Italy should also declare war against Austria; that neither would make a separate peace; that if the allies were successful, Italy should receive Venetia from Austria and Prussia an equivalent amount of Austrian territory.

From the moment this treaty was signed Bismarck devoted all his efforts to bringing about the war with Austria within the three months. It was not difficult to find pretexts. The Treaty of Gastein proved a most convenient aid. Prussia protested vigorously against Austria's method of administering Holstein. Austria resented the criticism as an impertinent interference in her own affairs. Relations between the two powers thus became strained to the breaking point, and both began to arm. Still some weeks went by before hostilities commenced.

Bismarck prepares for a war with Austria.

Bismarck's ultimate purpose in all his actions was the acquisition of the leadership in Germany for Prussia away from Austria. He was preparing a German civil war for that end; but he wished to give it a broader basis than a

mere sordid quarrel about the northern duchies, in which no idea was apparent save self-aggrandizement. He now sought to give a new turn and a more important character to this rivalry of Austria and Prussia. He preferred to appear to be fighting for the reform of the German Confederation rather than for the duchies. On April 9th, the very day after the signature of the treaty with Italy, and in consonance with one of its provisions, that very one, indeed, on which the whole treaty rested, he caused the Prussian plan for the reform of the Confederation to be introduced into the Diet at Frankfort. The plan was entirely unexpected. It was vague in all that concerned the relations of the princes to each other, but definite in that it proposed that in addition to the Diet there should be chosen by universal suffrage a popular chamber to share in the management of common affairs. The amazement of German Liberals was unbounded. Here was the man who had spent his life deriding and defying parliaments and ridiculing democracy now adopting its extreme demand—universal suffrage. The Liberals thought it a mere trick and did not take the proposal seriously. This was a turning point in Bismarck's career. He was now presenting a scheme for the reorganization of Germany, and he saw that if Prussia was to gain the leadership she must make some sacrifices to the feelings of the other states. They would not willingly accept the leadership of an autocratic, parliament-defying Prussia. By conceding universal suffrage, liberal opinion, hitherto hostile to Prussia, might be won. The full effect of this proposal was not seen until later. Prussia's power was not immediately increased, owing to the distrust which Bismarck's career inspired in the minds of Liberals. It seems likely that Bismarck did not now fear universal suffrage, as he had seen how favorably it had worked in France for a despotic Emperor.

Bismarck proposes a reform of the Confederation.

Even after this there was delay. Bismarck was still waiting for the provocation to come from Austria. He

wished to throw upon her the odium of beginning the civil war which he was doing everything in his power to render inevitable. At last the moment came. On June 1, 1866, Austria brought the Schleswig-Holstein question before the Diet. At once Bismarck declared that this was a breach of the Treaty of Gastein. That agreement was, therefore, void and Prussian troops were sent into Holstein, Austria's jurisdiction. Austria on June 11th moved in the Diet that the Federal forces be sent against Prussia. Prussia announced to the other states that every vote in favor of this motion would be regarded as a declaration of war. On June 14th the vote was taken and the motion carried. Pronouncing this levying of war by the Confederation against one of its members illegal, Prussia declared the Confederation dissolved, again brought forward her reform plans, and prepared for immediate action.

Prussia withdraws from the Confederation.

Thus the German civil war began. Bismarck had brought about his dream of a conflict between peoples of the same race to determine the question of control. It proved to be one of the shortest wars in history, one of the most decisive, and one whose consequences were most momentous. It is called the Seven Weeks' War. It began June 16, 1866, was virtually decided on July 3d, was brought to a close before the end of that month by the preliminary Peace of Nikolsburg, July 26th, which was followed a month later by the definitive Peace of Prague, August 23. Prussia had no German allies of any importance. Several of the North German states sided with her, but these were small and their armies were unimportant. On the other hand, Austria was supported by the four kingdoms, Bavaria, Würtemberg, Saxony, and Hanover; also by Hesse-Cassel, Hesse-Darmstadt, Nassau, and Baden. But Prussia had one important ally, Italy, without whose aid she might not have won the victory. The Prussian army, however, was better prepared. For years the rulers of Prussia had been preparing for war, perfecting the army down to the

The Austro-Prussian war.

minutest detail, and with scientific thoroughness, and when the war began it was absolutely ready. Moreover, it was directed by the greatest military genius Europe has seen since Napoleon, General von Moltke. Moltke had studied profoundly Napoleon's methods. A thorough master of the principles of war, he was particularly remarkable as an organizer. He had carefully worked out the relation to war of the modern means of rapid communication, the railway and the telegraph. Devoting endless time and thought to elaborate, minute preparation, so that it happened that no army ever in history had been able to get under way with the quickness of the one he commanded, he also displayed audacity in action. He had, moreover, under him men similarly trained in theory, in the actual handling of troops, and with similar qualities of intelligence, judgment, and daring.

Hellmuth von Moltke, 1800-1891.

On the other hand, the Austrian army had as commander Benedek, who said of himself that he could command a division, but felt unable to command an army, forced, however, by loyalty to the Emperor to accept a command which he had at first refused. His army also had no such perfection of organization as had that of Prussia. Moreover, Austria had two enemies to fight—one in front, Prussia; one in the rear, Italy, a condition always full of danger.

Prussia conquers North Germany.

Prussia had many enemies. Being absolutely prepared, while her enemies were not, she could assume the offensive, and this was the cause of her first victories. War began June 16th. Within three days Prussian troops had occupied Hanover, Dresden, and Cassel, the capitals of her three North German enemies. The Hanoverian army defeated the Prussian at Langensalza June 27th, but was compelled to capitulate two days later, the Prussians having received large reinforcements. The King of Hanover and the Elector of Hesse were taken prisoners of war. All North Germany was now controlled by Prussia, and within two weeks

of the opening of the war she was ready to attempt the great plan of Moltke, an invasion of Bohemia. The rapidity of the campaign struck Europe with amazement. Moltke sent three armies by different routes into Bohemia, and on July 3, 1866, one of the great battles of history, that of Königgrätz, or Sadowa, was fought. Each army numbered over 200,000, the Prussians outnumbering the Austrians, though not at the beginning. Since the battle of Leipsic in 1813, so many troops had not been engaged in a single conflict. King William, Bismarck, Roon, and Moltke took up their position on a hill, whence they could view the scene. The battle was long and doubtful. Beginning early in the morning, it continued for hours, fought with terrific fury, the Prussians making no advance against the Austrian artillery. Up to two o'clock it seemed an Austrian victory, but with the arrival of the Prussian Crown Prince with his army the issue was turned, and at half-past three the Austrians were beaten and their retreat began. They had lost over forty thousand men, while the Prussian loss was about ten thousand. The Prussian army during the next three weeks advanced to within sight of the spires of Vienna.

The battle of Königgrätz or Sadowa.

On June 24th the Austrians had been victorious over the Italians at Custozza. Yet the Italians had helped Prussia in detaining 80,000 Austrian troops, which, had they been at Königgrätz, would probably have turned the day. The Italian fleet was also defeated by the Austrian at Lissa, July 20th.

Prussia still had enemies, the Confederate armies, and the troops of the South German states, notably Bavaria. But she made equally short work of these obstacles. The Bavarian army was defeated at Kissingen July 10th. Finally Frankfort, hitherto the seat of the German Confederation, was entered July 16th. The southern states sued for peace.

The causes of the overthrow of Austria were numerous.

Causes of Austria's defeat.

Some have already been indicated. The armies which Moltke commanded were probably the best that had ever appeared upon the field of battle, and they were directed by a single master-mind which gave coherence and harmony to their movements. The Austrian army, on the other hand, was, in point of military instruction, inferior. Moreover, it was not pervaded by the same single, national enthusiasm. Austria was not a single people, but a collection of peoples, who were separated by jealousies and animosities, and the army exemplified these divisions. The Hungarians gave no enthusiastic support, for, since 1849, they had been alienated from the Empire which had taken away their Constitution. The Slavs were lukewarm, hating the Government of Vienna, which was largely German. The allies of Austria in Germany were poorly equipped, poorly commanded, and unable to co-operate heartily. Again, while the Austrian artillery and cavalry were superior to the Prussian, the infantry was equipped with a weapon far inferior. The "needle gun is king," said the London *Times* after the news of Königgrätz. This gun was superior to the Austrian in that, being more easily loaded, it could be discharged four or five times a minute, while the Austrian gun could be discharged only once. In almost all the encounters of the war the losses were proportionate to the rapidity of fire. Again, the tactics of the Austrians increased their losses immensely. They fought in serried ranks, while the Prussians, having learned that the progress in firearms rendered such methods very costly, fought in loose order, taking advantage of the inequalities of surface, and of the protection afforded by trees and thickets.

Results of the Austro-Prussian war.

The results of the Seven Weeks' War were momentous. Fearing the intervention of Europe, and particularly that of France, which was threatened, and which might rob the victory of its fruits, Bismarck wished to make peace at once, and consequently offered very lenient terms to Austria. His moderation was bitterly opposed by the military leaders of

Prussia,[1] but finally won the day, and the Preliminaries of Nikolsburg were agreed to, July 26th. Austria was to cede Venetia to Italy, but was to lose no other territory. She was to pay a small indemnity and was to withdraw permanently from the German Confederation, which, indeed, was to cease to exist. She was to allow Prussia to organize and lead a new confederation, composed of those states which were north of the river Main. The South German states were left free to act as they chose. Thus Germany, north of the Main, was to be united.

Annexations to Prussia.

Having accomplished this, Prussia proceeded to make important annexations to her own territory. The Kingdom of Hanover, the Duchies of Nassau and Hesse-Cassel, and the free city of Frankfort, as well as the Duchies of Schleswig and Holstein, were incorporated in the Prussian kingdom. Her population was thereby increased by over four and a half million new subjects, and thus was about twenty-four million. Her territory was increased by thirteen hundred square miles, almost a fourth of her former area. Her western and eastern provinces were thus finally united by the absorption of those states that lay between, and she now gained a cohesion she had always lacked. She henceforth controlled the northern coast of Germany, with brief gaps, from Russia to Holland. There was no thought of having the people of these states vote on the question of annexation, as had been done in Italy, and in Savoy and Nice. They were annexed forthwith by right of military conquest. Reigning houses ceased to rule on order from Berlin. With singular fatuity European nations allowed the swift consummation of these changes, which altered the balance of power and the map of Europe—a mistake that France in particular was to repent most bitterly. "I do

[1] This is explicitly asserted by Bismarck in one of the most dramatic sections of his *Reflections and Reminiscences* (II, 47-54). On the other hand the correctness of his assertion has been subjected to very damaging criticism by Professor Max Lenz. See Lenz, Zur Kritik der Gedanken und Erinnerungen des Fürsten Bismarck, 58-132.

not like this dethronement of dynasties," said the Tsar, but he failed to express his dislike in action.[1]

Bismarck, now wishing for the support of the Liberals in his future work, came before the Chamber of Deputies and asked and received an indemnity for having governed without a budget. Thus he recognized the rights of the Chamber under the Constitution. But this action was more formal than real. The Crown had won these amazing successes in the face of the bitter opposition of the Chamber, opposition to the reorganization of the army, to the war with Denmark, and to the war with Austria. The Crown had defeated Parliament morally, as well as practically. The confidence of the German people in parliamentary government was seriously undermined.

The North German Confederation, 1867-1871.

The German Confederation, established in 1815, disappeared forever in the cataclysm of 1866. The Diet of Frankfort was no more. Austria was excluded from Germany by the Treaty of Prague. There was now formed a new confederation, more limited geographically, but of far greater power than the old—a real federal state. This North German Confederation included all Germany north of the river Main, twenty-two states in all: i.e., two kingdoms, Prussia and Saxony; ten duchies, seven principalities, and the free cities of Hamburg, Lübeck, and Bremen. Not included were Bavaria, Würtemberg, Baden, and that part of Hesse-Darmstadt south of the boundary river.

The Constitution of this new state merits examination, as, with certain slight and formal changes, it subsists to-day as the Constitution of Germany. Bismarck was its author. After some amendments were made in it with Prussia's consent, it was accepted by the Governments of the several

[1] The Russian Government, declaring that, as the German Confederation had been founded in 1815 by the Congress of Vienna, to which all the powers were parties, it could not be abolished by Prussia alone, proposed a new international congress to settle the terms of peace. Against this proposal Bismarck assumed an attitude so highly belligerent, threatening war *à outrance*, that it was dropped.

states, and was then submitted in 1867 to a National Assembly chosen by manhood suffrage for the purpose. Passed by this body with some slight alterations, it was finally ratified without further amendment by the legislatures of the several states.

The Bundesrath.

The new federal organization was to consist of a President, the King of Prussia, of a Federal Council (Bundesrath), and a Parliament (Reichstag). The Federal Council was really the old Diet of Frankfort, preserved in the new scheme. It was to be composed of delegates sent by the sovereigns of the different states, to be recalled at their pleasure, bound by instructions given them by their princes. The voting power of the different states was fixed arbitrarily and not according to population, differing from the Senate of the United States in that the number of votes allotted the different states greatly varied. There were to be 43 votes in all. Of these Prussia was to have 17, Saxony 4, Mecklenburg-Schwerin and Brunswick 2, each of the others 1. In order to have a majority, Prussia would have to gain the support of five little principalities, which she could easily do. In regard to military organization, no change might be made in the laws without the consent of Prussia.

The Reichstag.

Associated with this Bundesrath, or Council of Princes, as it really was, was the Reichstag, or Parliament, composed of 297 members, elected by direct manhood suffrage and by secret ballot, for three years. Of the two bodies the Reichstag was much the less important, therein differing from the popularly elected chamber in other countries. The emphasis in this new organization of Germany was put upon the princes, the sovereigns, not upon the people. The people were given a place in the system, but a subordinate one. Bismarck always considered the Bundesrath the key to the Constitution. Large powers of legislation were given to the new government. All laws and all taxes must pass both chambers.

The new Constitution went into force July 1, 1867. "Let

us work quickly," Bismarck said while the Constitution was under disscusion, "let us put Germany in the saddle; she will soon learn to ride," another Bismarckian prophecy destined to come true. Germany now entered upon a period of remarkable progress, which has continued to this day. Legislative activity supplemented and clinched the triumphs of diplomacy and war. The old Confederation had failed in two particulars, said Bismarck in the Parliament of 1867: it had failed to insure the national safety, and it had failed to develop adequately the prosperity of the nation. These were not to be the failures of the new. Its military strength was amply assured. The armies of the different states were now all organized on the Prussian model, with the President of the Confederation as chief. He now commanded an army of 800,000 men. Moreover, Bismarck was able, by playing upon their fear of France, to induce the South German states to enter into a military alliance, offensive and defensive, with the North German Confederation. This increased the army to over a million. In a military sense Germany was unified.

Alliance with South German states.

Laws were rapidly passed aiming to increase the material well-being, to enlist firmly on the side of the new experiment the capitalist, industrial classes. The growth of the modern industrial system had been, as we have seen, one of the forces making for unity. It had greatly helped to create the situation in which Bismarck had been able to work so effectively. The business world now demanded that the state reward it by the removal of many restrictions which had survived the Zollverein and which hampered economic activity. Certain laws which restricted the free movement of the people were repealed, passports being suppressed, the absolute, unqualified right of every citizen to reside anywhere in the Confederation guaranteed. This aided industries by providing them a free and mobile labor market. In place of the medley of weights and measures of the different states, which were a hindrance to commerce, a uniform plan was adopted, based upon the metric and

Consolidating the new system.

decimal systems. A single monetary system was also decreed in place of the great variety of currencies in vogue. The formation of business corporations was encouraged. Laws limiting the rate of interest were abolished. The postal system was reorganized. Commercial treaties were made with other nations. Workingmen were given the right to form unions. The results of all this activity were notable. The pecuniary advantage of large and influential classes lay in the success of the Confederation. Economic life bound the different states every year more tightly together.

Meanwhile Germans were biding the time when by the addition of the South German states the political unity would be complete. This was to be the result of the Franco-German war of 1870.

CHAPTER XII

THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE SECOND EMPIRE

We have traced the rise of Italy, the rise of Prussia. We have now to trace the decline and fall of the French Empire. The history of that Empire from its foundation in 1852 to 1860 has been described. It was a period of despotic government, and of great and uninterrupted success. The period from 1860 to 1870 witnesses the gradual transformation of the Empire from autocracy to liberalism, the rise of a vigorous party of opposition, a disastrous foreign policy, a growing demoralization within the state, and a final, tragic collapse.

Disastrous effect of the Italian war upon Napoleon III.

The turning point in the history of the Empire was the Italian war. However beneficial to Italy, that war raised up for Napoleon a host of enemies in France. One of its features had been the attack upon the temporal power of the Papacy. That power was not overthrown in fact, but it was in principle. The Pope had lost most of his states, the rest were in danger. Catholics were bitter in their denunciation of Napoleon. This was most damaging for him, as his strongest supporters had hitherto been the clergy, the clerical press, and the faithful. But other groups also were offended: monarchists, because of the overthrow of the kingdom of Naples and the duchies; patriots of various affiliations and members of the liberal constitutional party in Parliament, because they believed the erection of a strong state to the southeast of France prejudicial to her best interests, it being better to have several weak states as neighbors than a single strong one.

Only the democratic party in France seemed pleased with this venture, and for reasons that might well give the Emperor pause. This was the smallest of all the parties. It was by its fundamental principles opposed to the very existence of the Empire. "To find partisans of an Italian war, one must seek them in those circles which are plotting the overthrow of the Empire," an official had reported to the Emperor before ever the war had begun. These democrats approved a war against Austria, the traditional opponent of liberalism. They favored a war that might damage another enemy of theirs, the Roman Catholic Church. They applauded it warmly because its tendency seemed to be inevitably democratic and anti-clerical. They were pleased to have the Emperor enter upon a doubtful adventure, believing that one adventure might lead to others, that he would alienate former supporters, and would therefore be forced to seek new ones, and that thus a situation favorable to themselves might be created. But even they were disappointed at the outcome of the war and were therefore critical. The Austrians were still in Venetia; the Pope was still in Rome.

The war approved only by the democratic party.

The Emperor's reputation as a ruler, of intelligent views and of decision of character, was damaged both at home and abroad. As the war progressed it revealed the lack in its author of any definite purpose to be vigorously adhered to, Napoleon III at first agreeing to drive the Austrians out of the peninsula and to free Italy from the Alps to the Adriatic, then stopping midway in the process and dictating the Preliminaries of Villafranca and the Peace of Zurich, only to permit them both to become immediately dead letters, and watching the revolution, unchained by his act, progress until the most sweeping change in Italian history had been effected and unification had been practically achieved. By a policy, alternately so reckless and so pusillanimous, he lessened his prestige, for he showed that though he could inaugurate momentous movements, he had not the power or sagacity or courage to control them. By participating in the over-

Napoleon's vacillation.

throw of long-established, legitimate governments, he made legitimate governments everywhere suspicious and even hostile; by declaring that he was seeking only justice and not aggrandizement and then adding Savoy and Nice to France as payment for his services, he alienated England, as well as other states, which saw only hypocrisy in his acts and which feared that he was desirous of repeating the policy of conquest of his illustrious uncle. Such was the outcome of a policy, fortunate for the Italians, unfortunate for the Emperor. The next decade is a long commentary upon Napoleon's initial error. For ten years he was to experience to the full the embarrassments created by his ill-advised Italian policy.

England offended.

Treaty of commerce offends Protectionists.

It was at this time that in a different sphere he offended another powerful interest at home. He made in 1860, with unusual secrecy, a treaty of commerce with England. This treaty involved a great reduction of duties on many articles, and was a step in the direction of free trade. While popular with political economists, and while probably advantageous to France as a whole, it was bitterly resented by the great manufacturers, who, given no warning and therefore no time to adapt themselves to changed conditions, believed that they would be utterly ruined. Four hundred of them came to Paris to seek an audience with the Emperor in order to present their cause. They were unsuccessful. The audience was not granted, but they published a vehement protest against the new policy. "We are about to be condemned without having been heard." But while the manufacturers were indignant, many in France were grateful, notably the wine producers, who, according to the new treaty, would have a larger market in England than ever. But the Emperor had thus by 1860 offended large and influential classes: Catholics in their beliefs by his Italian policy; manufacturers, protectionists, in their interests by his treaty of commerce, a treaty which, it was declared, sacrificed French interests to English, as the war,

it was likewise declared, had subordinated the welfare of France to that of Italy.

Napoleon turns to the Liberals.

Feeling that he was losing strength with the Conservatives, Napoleon now began to seek the support of the Liberals, hitherto his bitter opponents. This was the beginning of the so-called Liberal Empire, marked, as the years went, by ever greater concessions, until at the end the character of the government was completely transformed. Thus in 1859 Napoleon issued an amnesty which permitted the Republicans who had been driven from France by the coup d'état of 1851 to return. Many were prisoners in Algeria, in Guiana. Many were exiles in Belgium, Switzerland, England. From these countries the exiles now came back, but not all of them. "I shall return," said Victor Hugo, "when Liberty returns."

Powers of Parliament increased.

Napoleon next took a step which seemed to indicate that he was finally to enter upon the work of crowning his régime with liberty, which he had declared to be the ideal of the Napoleonic system. In November 1860 he slightly enlarged the power of the legislature. By the decree of November 24th he gave the Senate and Legislative Body the right at the opening of each session to frame an address to the monarch in reply to his address from the throne. Such was the custom in England, and such had been the custom in France under the parliamentary monarchy from 1815 to 1848. This gave the legislature the chance once a year to discuss the whole policy of the Government, as each phrase of the address was being composed and debated. Everything could be passed in review at that time. Another innovation, hardly less noteworthy, was made at the same time. A full stenographic report of the sessions of the Legislative Body was henceforth to be published. The people were no longer to be required to content themselves with a concise, dry, analytical report of these sessions, relegated to the most obscure part of the paper, but now the eloquence of the Chamber might be known to all the country, im-

passioned, incisive, instructive. Another article provided that henceforth ministers, representing the Government, should appear before the Chambers authorized to explain and defend its policy.

Though by this famous decree Napoleon III divested himself of none of his prerogatives, nevertheless the importance of Parliament was henceforth increased. This was the first and most important of the successive steps in the evolution of the autocratic into the liberal Empire. But the Emperor was mistaken in supposing that he could win the Liberals to his side. He was simply giving them greater opportunities for opposition. Under the operation of this decree parliamentary life awoke again in France. Communication between the Legislative Body and the country, broken since 1852, was re-established. Extraordinary interest was shown by the people in the next session of that Chamber, which was characterized by much brilliant oratory and keen criticism. It was noted with surprise that many of the most effective speeches were directed against this or that phase of the imperial government. The Emperor had evoked a spirit which it would be difficult to suppress. The Opposition in the Chamber was small numerically, but was aggressive. That it produced some effect was shown by the next elections, those of 1863, when its number increased from five to thirty-five, of whom seventeen were out-and-out Republicans. This was, of course, a powerless minority in a chamber of nearly 260 members. But the popular vote was significant. The opponents of the Empire, Catholics, Protectionists, Monarchists, Republicans, had obtained about two million votes—almost a third of those cast.

Revival of interest in politics.

Rise of a Republican Party.

It was just this time, when various difficulties were arising about him more troublesome than any which he had previously encountered, that Napoleon chose for another enterprise most unnecessary, most reckless, and in the end most disastrous. He undertook to erect an empire five thousand

miles away, in a country of which he knew but little, and in which political institutions had for half a century rested on a very shifting basis—Mexico.

The Mexican expedition.

England, Spain, and France had certain grievances against Mexico for her unjust treatment of their citizens resident there, and when the Mexican Government suspended by arbitrary decree the payment of interest on bonds held abroad, they proceeded to organize an intervention. They were the more able to do this than in ordinary times, owing to the fact that the United States, the natural opponent of any such intervention, was then involved in a civil war that forbade her attempting to prevent it. Consequently, in October 1861 these three powers signed the Treaty of London agreeing upon joint intervention for the sole purpose of securing adequate protection for Europeans resident in Mexico, and the proper discharge of financial obligations incurred by that country by previous treaties. The Allies expressly stated that they had no intention of making territorial conquests or of overthrowing the existing Mexican government, which was a republic under Juarez as president. The expedition was sent out, arriving in December 1861 and January 1862. But by April it became clear to Spain and England that France had distinctly other purposes in this affair than those stated in the treaty of alliance. Napoleon's real intentions, shortly apparent, were the overthrow of the republic and the establishment of a monarchy in Mexico under a European prince. The English and Spaniards would give no sanction to such a scheme, and consequently entirely withdrew in April 1862. The expedition now became one purely French. The question of financial honesty on the part of Mexico was lost sight of, and a war began, a war of aggression, entirely uncalled for, but a war which in the end punished its author more than it did the Mexicans, one of the most dishonorable, as it was one of the most costly and disastrous, for the Second Empire.

Napoleon's purposes.

Napoleon III was a man of ideas, a man of imagination, with a mind ranging boldly and far at times. His ideas were frequently grandiose, yet vague and dim, his imagination lively, yet frequently unsound, superficial, deceptive. While a prisoner in the fortress of Ham he had written and published a pamphlet concerning America. In this he proclaimed the necessity of digging a great canal to connect the Atlantic and Pacific. On it a "new Constantinople" might arise, near the borders of North America and South America, as ancient Byzantium had arisen at the point where Europe and Asia meet. The founder of such a place might work out for the new world what had been worked out in Europe—an equilibrium of the different forces —by strengthening the enfeebled Latin element and hemming in the overflowing Anglo-Saxon element.

The theory of nationalities would thus win another victory. Latins would hold in check the aggressive Anglo-Saxons. The colonies of Spain and France would be more secure, French commerce would find new outlets, the materials for French industries would be more easily procured. And, said Napoleon, "We shall have established our beneficent influence in the center of America." Another reason may have influenced the Emperor. The Republic of Mexico had in some of its legislation deeply offended the Roman Catholic Church. Might he not win back the favor of Catholics forfeited by his Italian expedition by undertaking this one?

Napoleon overthrows the Mexican Republic.

This expedition for the overthrow of the Mexican Republic, pronounced by courtiers "the grandest thought of the reign," was a long drawn out folly. The French troops were checked at Puebla on May 5, 1862—the first military defeat of the Empire. But, reinforced, they were victorious, and General Forey, the French commander, called together an assembly of Mexican notables of the opposition party, which decreed that Mexico should henceforth be an Empire, and which offered the imperial crown to Archduke Maximilian

of Austria, brother of Francis Joseph, since 1848 Emperor of Austria. This assembly represented, perhaps, 350,000 people out of about 7,000,000. It offered a fatal gift. This young prince of thirty-one was of attractive and popular manners, and of liberal ideas. Young, handsome, versatile, half poet, half scientist, he was living in a superb palace, Miramar, overlooking the Mediterranean, amid his collections, his objects of art, and with the sea which was his passion always before him. From out of this enchanting retreat he now emerged to become the central figure of a short and frightful tragedy. Mexico lured him to his doom. Influenced by his own ambition and that of his spirited wife, Carlotta, daughter of Leopold I, King of Belgium, and receiving definite promises of French military support until 1867, he accepted the imperial crown and arrived in Mexico in May 1864.

Disastrous outcome of this adventure.

This entire project, born in the brain of Napoleon III, was to prove hopeless from the start, disastrous to all who participated in it, to the new Emperor and Empress, and to Napoleon. The difficulties confronting the new monarch were insuperable. A guerilla warfare was carried on successfully by Juarez, using up the French soldiers and putting them on the defensive. Even the communications of the French army with the sea were seriously threatened. Maximilian at last issued a decree that any enemies taken with arms would be summarily shot—a decree that made him hated by all Mexicans, and that gave to the war a character of extreme atrocity. A greater danger threatened the new empire when General Lee surrendered at Appomattox. The United States had looked from the first with disapprobation upon Napoleon's project. Now that the Civil War was over, she threatened intervention. Napoleon was unwilling to risk a conflict with this country, and consequently promised to withdraw his troops speedily from Mexico. Maximilian could not remain long an Emperor without Napoleon's support. His wife, Carlotta, return-

Intervention of the United States.

ing to Europe to persuade Napoleon in frantic personal interviews not to desert them, received no promise of support from the man who had planned the whole adventure, and in the fearful agony of her contemplation of the impending doom of her husband became insane. Maximilian was taken by the Mexicans and shot June 19, 1867. The phantom empire vanished.

Discomfiture of Napoleon III.

A most expensive enterprise for the French Emperor. It had eaten into the financial resources of France, already badly disorganized. It had prevented his playing a part in decisive events occurring in central Europe in 1864-66, in the Danish war, and the Austro-Prussian war, the outcome of which was to alter so seriously the importance of France in Europe by the exaltation of an ambitious, aggressive, and powerful military state, Prussia. It had damaged him morally before Europe by the desertion of his protégés to an appalling fate before the threats of the United States. His army had once been repelled, before Puebla in 1862, the first military defeat in his reign. He had squandered uselessly his military resources and had increased the national debt. It has been asserted that the Mexican war was as disastrous for Napoleon III as the Spanish war had been for Napoleon I.

Additional concessions to liberalism.

In 1868, after the great humiliation resulting from the Mexican war and from the futile attempts to play an effective part in European diplomacy in the crowded years of 1864-68, which will be described later, Napoleon III, feeling greatly the need of new sources of strength, could only turn to the Liberals with still larger concessions. Other motives influenced him to go further in this direction than he had previously gone. He had declared at the beginning of his reign that autocratic power was to be merely provisional, that liberty should crown the edifice. Liberal-minded by nature, he saw that he could not safely postpone the day. Time was passing. Sixteen years had gone by and the system of 1852 was still almost entirely intact.

Moreover, he was now becoming prematurely old, and was suffering acutely from disease, a fact that must be borne in mind henceforth as helping to explain the vacillation and languor at critical times of this man, who had previously acted with decision and promptness. Self-interest also would be served in another way. As his policy was now sadly compromised in every way, there would be evident advantage in making the assembly, the people, share the responsibility with himself. In 1867 the right of *interpellation* was granted the Chamber, which gave its members the power to question the ministers concerning their acts and policies at any moment. In 1868, upon the Emperor's recommendation, a law was passed freeing the press from a considerable number of restrictions that had previously weighted it; also a law permitting, under certain elaborate conditions, the right of holding public meetings.

The right of interpellation granted.

The Empire had thus entered upon a frankly liberal path. The result was not to strengthen, but greatly to weaken it. Many new journals were founded, in which it was assailed with amazing bitterness. A remarkable freedom of speech characterizes the last two years of Napoleon's reign. A movement to erect a monument to a republican deputy, Baudin, who had been shot on the barricades in 1851 at the time of the coup d'état, seemed to the Government to be too insulting. It prosecuted the men who were conducting the subscription. One of these was defended by a brilliant, impassioned young lawyer and orator from the south of France, thirty years of age, who was shortly to be a great figure in politics, a founder of the Third Republic. Gambetta conducted himself not as a lawyer defending his client, but as an avenger of the wrongs of France for the past seventeen years, impeaching bitterly the entire reign of Napoleon III. Particularly did he dwell upon the date of December 2d. The coup d'état, he said, was carried through by a crowd of unknown men "without talent, without honor, and hopelessly involved in

Dramatic emergence of Léon Gambetta.

debts and crimes." "These men pretend to have saved society. Do you save a country when you lay parricidal hands upon it?" The end of this remarkable discourse remains famous: "Listen, you who for seventeen years have been absolute master of France. The thing that characterizes you best, because it is evidence of your own remorse, is the fact that you have never dared to say: We will place among the solemn festivals of France, we will celebrate as a national anniversary, the Second of December. . . . Well! this aniversary we will take for ourselves; we will observe it always, always without fail; every year it shall be the anniversary of our dead, until the day when the country, having become master itself once more, shall impose upon you the great national expiation in the name of liberty, equality, and fraternity."

Bitter attacks upon Napoleon III.

This address had a prodigious effect. Nothing so defiant, so contemptuous of the Government, had been heard in France since 1851. Though Gambetta's client lost his case, it was generally felt that the Empire emerged from that court-room soundly beaten. It was clear that there was a party in existence bent upon revenge, and willing to use all the privileges a now liberal Emperor might grant, not gratefully, but as a means of completely annihilating the very Empire, a Republican party, aggressive, and growing, already master of Paris, and organizing in the departments.

The Third Party.

There was also in existence another party which played a commanding and decisive part in the closing years of the reign, the Third Party, so called from the fact that it stood between the thorough-going supporters of the Empire and the Republicans, its active enemies. This party was willing to support the Empire loyally if Napoleon would make it frankly and completely liberal, that is, if he would substitute a completely parliamentary system of government for personal rule. This party was led by Ollivier, formerly a Republican.

Two policies were now urged upon Napoleon, one by those of his immediate circle—a return to the strong measures of 1852, a renouncement of all compromises with the Liberals; the other, the one advocated by the Third Party. The elections of 1869 reinforced the latter by showing that, though 4,438,000 votes had been cast for the official candidates, 3,355,000 had been cast for those opposed. Napoleon adopted the plan of the Third Party, and by a *senatus consultum* of September 8, 1869, supplemented by another of April 20, 1870, the political system of the Empire was completely transformed. The Senate was deprived of its powers as guardian of the Constitution, and became a law-making chamber simply. The Legislative Body became complete master of itself, having the right to choose its own officers, to make its own rules, to initiate legislation, and to demand explanations of the ministers, who were declared responsible. Finally, on January 2, 1870, Ollivier was himself made head of the ministry, and was supported by a majority of the Chamber. Ollivier felt that he could assure the Emperor a "happy old age," and his son a quiet accession to the throne.

The transformation of the Empire completed.

The approval of the people was now sought for these changes. As the Constitution of 1852 had been ratified by popular vote, ought not the Constitution of 1870, so profoundly altered in the course of the last ten years, to be likewise approved? Believing that a vote of France on all these changes would only consolidate them and put behind the Emperor an immense popular support, thus enabling him easily to dominate all the hostile parties which had recently become so aggressive and annoying, Napoleon now invited the people to vote on this proposition: "The French nation approves the liberal reforms made in the Constitution since 1860, and ratifies the *senatus consultum* of April 20, 1870." Then followed the Constitution in forty-five articles, assuring, among other things, the transmission of the imperial dignity in the direct line of Napoleon III.

Popular approval.

The plébiscite of May, 1870.

The plébiscite took place May 8, 1870, and resulted overwhelmingly in favor of the Empire, 7,358,786 voted yes; 1,571,939 voted no. Napoleon III could claim that he had as many supporters in 1870 as in 1852. The Republicans, a small minority, opposed this plébiscite, not because they did not believe in the right of the people to rule, but because they considered it in this case a mere trick to gain an apparent absolution for the sins of the Empire. Every one must approve the reforms, but would not such a vote mean that reform need go no further? Now, said Gambetta, only one form of government adequately expresses universal suffrage—the Republic. This party, revolutionary in its aims, appeared now to be utterly discredited by the great success of the Empire in the plébiscite. Yet its victory was very near. The Empire seemed solidly re-established upon the confidence of the people. In less than three months, however, it had declared a war against Prussia, in the midst of which it utterly collapsed and was succeeded by the Republic. To understand the reasons for this sudden and complete downfall, it is necessary to survey the diplomacy of the period just preceding 1870, and to describe the general and immediate causes of that war.

Sudden collapse of the Empire.

CHAPTER XIII

THE FRANCO-GERMAN WAR

Concerning that diplomacy much is known but much remains obscure. Not until the archives of France and Germany, the papers of Napoleon III, William I, Bismarck, and their ministers and agents are freely given to the world will it stand forth fully revealed. Yet fragmentary and unsatisfactory as our information is, the broad outlines of the story can be drawn with reasonable certitude.

Up to 1862 Napoleon had been uniformly successful. He had defeated Russia and Austria, supposed to be the two most redoubtable military powers in Europe, in the Crimean and Italian wars. In 1862, however, he entered upon the ill-starred Mexican expedition, the "grandest thought of the reign," as his courtiers mispronounced it. This weakened him in many ways, indicated above, but, particularly did it trammel him in his European diplomacy, at the very time when events were crowding upon each other thick and fast, altering profoundly the face of Europe. Napoleon, distracted by a wasting, distant, and inglorious war, was not able to act with decision in regard to the remodeling of central Europe, the rise of Prussia. Moreover, his intellectual limitations, his lack of clear thought and persistent action, his half-hearted, wavering, shifting nature were now brought out in high relief against the hard, practical, clean-cut, restrained yet ruthless character of the leader of this evolution of Germany, Otto von Bismarck. His doctrine of nationalities, on which he so prided himself, was now to turn against him to his own undoing. He had acted upon that doctrine in Italy with the result that an Italian Kingdom was in existence. He now, with singular fatuity, helped

Napoleon's unwise adherence to his doctrine of nationalities.

forward the development of another state on the frontiers of France—Prussia. In the Schleswig-Holstein affair of 1864 he secretly advised Prussia to take both duchies. "I shall always be consistent in my conduct," he had said in 1863. "If I have fought for the independence of Italy, if I have lifted up my voice for the Polish nationalities, I cannot have other sentiments in Germany, nor obey other principles." The strengthening of Prussia was a far more serious matter for France than the strengthening of Piedmont, as Prussia held the left bank of the Rhine, the Rhine provinces, which Frenchmen regarded as rightfully theirs. Frenchmen protested against this dangerous policy of encouraging the growth of the ambitious neighbor.

In 1866 Napoleon had an excellent opportunity to recover from his initial mistake in Germany. In that year Prussia and Austria went to war, nominally over the question of these very duchies, in reality for the leadership of central Europe. Bismarck, long planning such a war, had been particularly anxious about the attitude of France, and had sought to divine the probable conduct of the French Emperor, in the famous interview at Biarritz (1865). We have no official details as to the result of that interview, but it is clear that Bismarck left it with the conviction that Napoleon would be neutral. This would free Prussia from any anxiety about her western boundary, and she could throw her whole force to the south against Austria and her allies. It is evident that Napoleon looked forward to such a war between the two German powers with complacency. He believed there was nothing to fear from Prussia. He even urged Italy to conclude the treaty with Prussia, apparently thinking that the two combined could hold out longer against Austria. Thus, in his opinion, the war would be long, exhausting both combatants. At the proper time he could intervene, and from the distress of the rivals could extract gain for France, possibly the left bank of the Rhine, which Prussia might be willing to relinquish in return

The meeting at Biarritz.

for aid. His calculation was based upon his belief in the vast military superiority of Austria. The war came, and, contrary to expectation, it was short and swift. Prussia was victorious, not Austria. The battle of Königgrätz, or Sadowa, July 3, 1866, was decisive. Even then it was not too late for an intervention. Napoleon could have played a commanding part in determining the terms of peace had he threatened to come to the aid of Austria, as Austria desired. His Minister of Foreign Affairs said to him July 5th: "Let the Emperor make a simple military demonstration, and he will be astonished at the facility with which he will become arbiter and master of the situation without striking a blow." King William later said that the war of 1866 was the ruin of France, "because Napoleon should have attacked us in the rear." This was what Bismarck most feared.

Napoleon's failure to use his opportunity in 1866.

But the golden hour slipped by. Napoleon missed one of the greatest opportunities of his entire career. Had he refused to sanction the annexations of Prussia unless compensated, he could have secured important additions to France. Pacifically inclined, racked by a disease which reduced his powers of concentration and decision, perhaps distrustful of his army, which was depleted by the Mexican campaign and which had no eminent commander, his conduct was vacillating and weak. Accomplishing nothing for France, he yet irritated Prussia by a half measure of insisting that the new confederation should not extend south of the river Main.

The year 1866 a turning point in modern history.

The year 1866 is a turning point in the history of Prussia, of Austria, of France, of modern Europe. It profoundly altered the historic balance of power. By the decisiveness of the campaign, and by the momentous character of its consequences, Prussia, hitherto regarded as the least important of the great powers, had astounded Europe by the evidence of her strength. She possessed a remarkable army and a remarkable statesman. That both were the most

powerful in Europe was not entirely proved, but the feeling was widespread that such was the case. The center of interest in central Europe shifted from Vienna to Berlin. The reputation of Napoleon III was seriously compromised. The instinct of the French people saw in the battle of Königgrätz, or Sadowa, as they called it, a humiliating defeat for France, though it was a battle exclusively between Prussia and Austria, France being no party to the war. The instinct was largely right. At least the Peace of Prague involved and indicated the diminution of the authority and importance of France. For a reorganization so sweeping in central Europe, as the overthrow of Austria, her expulsion from Germany, and the consolidation and aggrandizement of Prussia, a powerful military state, upset the balance of power. A feeling of alarm spread through France. "Revenge for Sadowa," was a cry often heard henceforth. Its meaning was that if one state like Prussia should be increased in area and power, France also, for consenting to it, had a right to a proportionate increase, that the reciprocal relations might remain the same. The hold of the Emperor upon his own people was greatly weakened, and Napoleon knew it. To recover this, to renew his prestige by securing an increase of territory, he now resorted to diplomacy, seeking to appeal to the generosity or gratitude of Bismarck, having neglected to appeal to his fears. For a year negotiations went on, in 1866 and 1867, between the two powers, looking to some possible enlargement of the boundaries of France. These negotiations concerned, now the left bank of the Rhine, now Luxemburg, now Belgium. Bismarck drew them out in order to gain time and also evidence with which to discredit Napoleon still further. Then, at the ripe moment, he blocked every proposal, and no course was left open to the French Emperor but to adapt himself to his unhappy position. But French governmental circles, greatly chagrined and embittered, came more and more to entertain the idea

"Revenge for Sadowa."

Failure of Napoleon's diplomacy.

of war. The Emperor tried to persuade France that all these changes in central Europe had really increased the strength of France. The argument was labored, and, moreover, reacted most disastrously, for when in 1868 he urged the reform of the French army, largely along the lines of the Prussian organization, which had proved so successful, the Chamber acceded only in slight part, quoting his own assertion that France stood in Europe stronger than ever as a result of the Seven Weeks' War in Germany. Thus the one method of augmenting the influence of France was rejected, and Parliament must share the responsibility of the lack of preparation of 1870 with the Emperor and Liberals must share it with Conservatives. A few years earlier Napoleon might have forced such proposals through Parliament. In 1868 he was no longer in a position so to do. The Opposition was too numerous, and he had made too many enemies by his Italian and Mexican policies. Moreover, he had just increased the power of the legislature. And not for a moment admitting that the Empire was in danger, he could not use the greatest of all arguments—the safety of the state.

From 1866 to 1870 the idea that ultimately a war would come between Prussia and France became familiar to the people and Governments of both countries. Many Frenchmen desired "revenge for Sadowa." Prussians were proud and elated at their two successful wars, and intensely conscious of their new position in Europe. The newspapers of both countries during the next four years were full of crimination and recrimination, of abuse and taunt, the Government in neither case greatly discouraging their unwise conduct, at times even inspiring and directing it. Such an atmosphere was an excellent one for ministers who wanted war to work in, and both France and Prussia had just such ministers. Bismarck believed such a war inevitable, and, in his opinion, it was desirable as the only way of completing the unification of Germany, since Napoleon would never willingly con-

Bismarck regards a war with France as inevitable.

sent to the extension of the Confederation to include the South German states. All that he desired was that it should come at precisely the right moment, when Prussia was entirely ready, and that it should come by act of France, so that Prussia could pose before Europe as merely defending herself against a wanton aggressor. In his *Reminiscences* he avows that he entertained this belief as early as 1866: "That a war with France would succeed the war with Austria lay in the logic of history"; and again, "I did not doubt that a Franco-German war must take place before the construction of a United Germany could be realized." The unification of Germany being his supreme aim, he was bound by logic and ambition to see that that war occurred.

Unfortunately, there entered in 1870 into the Foreign Office of France a pronounced and bitter opponent of Prussia, the Duke of Gramont, a reckless and unwise politician, whose brief career in office was to be very costly to his country. With two such willing ministers, a cause of war was not long in being found. It was offered in a form which did not directly concern either Germany or France, the filling of the vacant throne of Spain.

The Spanish candidacy of Leopold of Hohenzollern.

In 1868 a revolution had occurred in Spain, which resulted in the overthrow and exile of the Queen Isabella II. The Provisional Government which then arose proceeded upon the task, always delicate, of finding a new ruler. It chose Prince Leopold of Hohenzollern, a kinsman of the King of Prussia, who at first declined. Three times the offer of the Spanish crown was made to Leopold, twice in 1869, and again in March 1870. In an interview with Bismarck in May 1869 Benedetti, French ambassador at Berlin, made it apparent that the candidacy of the Prince would be resented by France. Bismarck nevertheless secured from Spain a fourth offer, and Leopold this time accepted, largely persuaded thereto by Bismarck, sufficiently cognizant of the feeling of the French Emperor. The news that a Prussian Prince

had accepted the throne of Spain reached Paris by way of Madrid, July 2, 1870. Instantly great indignation was expressed in the newspapers. The excitement in Paris rapidly increased. Gramont declared in the Chamber that the election of the Prince was inadmissible as "upsetting to our disadvantage the present equilibrium of forces in Europe," and imperiling "the interests and honor of France." To prevent it, "we shall discharge our duty without hesitation and without weakness." Benedetti was ordered by the French Government to proceed at once to Ems, a watering resort near the Rhine, where King William was at the time, and to make a formal demand that the candidacy be withdrawn. Now neither Napoleon III, more and more exhausted by disease, nor the Prime Minister, Ollivier, desired war, though both were anxious for a diplomatic victory. Nor did William I desire it. Moreover, the Governments of England, Austria, Russia, and Belgium labored in the interests of peace. On July 12th the candidacy was announced withdrawn by the father of Prince Leopold.

The candidacy withdrawn.

The tension was immediately relieved: the war scare was over. Two men, however, were not pleased by this outcome, Gramont and Bismarck. This was, says a biographer of Bismarck, "the severest check which Bismarck's policy had yet received; he had persuaded the Prince to accept against his will; he had persuaded the King reluctantly to keep the negotiations secret from Napoleon; however others might disguise the truth he knew that they had had to retreat from an untenable position, and retreat before the noisy insults of the French press and the open menace of the French Government."[1] Bismarck considered the reverse so great and humiliating that he thought he must in self-respect resign and retire into private life.

He was to be saved from this by the folly of the French ministry, and by his own unscrupulousness. "The ministry

Folly of the Duke of Gramont.

[1] Headlam, Bismarck, 334.

has achieved," said Guizot, now a very old man, living in retirement, "the finest diplomatic victory which has been won in my lifetime." This victory was now thrown away. The whole matter was unwisely reopened and rendered far more acute by the French ministry, supported by the Parisian war party, which now made an additional demand, namely, that the King of Prussia should promise that this Hohenzollern candidacy should never be renewed. This demand was presented to William I by Benedetti, July 13th, in Ems. The King refused but with entire courtesy. In the meeting of the French ministers, held on the evening of the 13th, it was not felt that this refusal made war necessary.

Meanwhile King William had caused a description of the events of that day (July 13th) to be telegraphed to Bismarck, who was in Berlin, leaving with him the decision as to whether the facts of the new French demand and his refusal to entertain it be published. Here was Bismarck's opportunity, which he used ruthlessly and joyously to provoke the French to declare war. The form in which the Ems despatch was published was intended by him to be "a red flag for the Gallic bull," and certainly fulfilled the intention.

The Ems despatch.

The Ems despatch was not falsified, as has been frequently asserted, but it was condensed in such a fashion that the negotiations at Ems appeared to have been sharp and discourteous and abruptly terminated, whereas they had been courteous and respectful on both sides. While the text of the Ems despatch was not changed save by excision, the tone of it was greatly and intentionally altered, so that the Prussians thought that their King, the French that their ambassador, had been insulted. The effect of its publication on the 14th was instantaneous and malign. It aroused the indignation of both countries to fever heat. As if it were not sufficient, the newspapers of both teemed with false, abusive, and inflammatory accounts of the events at Ems. The voice of the advocates of peace was drowned in the general clamor. Napoleon did not wish war, but he was very ill,

and was swept from his real convictions by the war party. The Empress, it appears, urged it out of hatred of Prussia as a Protestant nation, and in the belief that it would strengthen the imperial throne. The ministry went with the current. No one in authority dared brave unpopularity in Paris, and consequently war credits were voted amid great excitement on July 15th and France entered into the valley of the shadow. Ollivier, head of the French ministry, declared that he accepted this war "with a light heart." Thiers, demanding that the Chamber be informed of the contents of the despatches which were prompting such perilous action and declaring that having gained "the essential thing we ought not to break because of a mere detail of form—ought not to effect a rupture on a question of touchiness" was hissed in the Chamber. War was declared by France virtually on July 15th, technically on July 19th. Only ten members in the Chamber, among whom were Thiers and Gambetta, voted against it. Paris resounded with cries, "On to Berlin!" Victory seemed certain. The Minister of War was confident. The Minister of Foreign Affairs believed that within a few hours the triple alliance for which there had been negotiations for some time would be concluded with Austria and Italy. The war grew directly out of mere diplomatic fencing. The French people did not desire it, only the people of Paris, inflamed by an official press. Indeed, until it was declared, the French people hardly knew of the matter of dispute. It came upon them unexpectedly. The war was made by the responsible heads of two Governments. It was in its origin in no sense national in either country. Its immediate occasion was trivial. But it was the cause of a remarkable display of patriotism in both countries.

The war party in Paris.

France declares war upon Prussia.

The war upon which the French ministry entered with so light a heart, was destined to prove the most disastrous in the history of their country. In every respect it was begun under singularly inauspicious circumstances. France declared war upon Prussia alone, but in a manner that

South German States join Prussia.

threw the South German states, upon whose support she had counted, directly into the camp of Bismarck. They regarded the French demand, that the King of Prussia should pledge himself for all time to forbid the Prince of Hohenzollern's candidature, as unnecessary and insulting. At once Bavaria and Baden and Würtemberg joined the campaign on the side of Prussia.

France isolated.

Not only Prussia therefore but united Germany stood confronting France. Moreover, Bismarck's diplomacy was able to isolate France from the rest of Europe. Bismarck published a draft of a treaty drawn up some years before, between Prussia and France, but never signed, which provided for the annexation of Belgium to France. France protested, but in vain, that the treaty had been dictated by Bismarck. This so worked upon English opinion, which has always opposed French extension northwards, that the English Government immediately proclaimed its neutrality. France had counted upon the ultimate aid of Austria, but Bismarck gained the support of Russia to this extent that Russia threatened to invade Austria if Austria supported France. Italy, too, was neutralized by the fact that she could not safely move alone.

Thus at the beginning of the month of August it was clear that France would have no ally. The French military authorities made the serious mistake of grossly underestimating the difficulty of the task before them. The Minister of War declared that France was ready, more than ready, that her preparations were more advanced than those of the enemy. The supreme folly of such an assertion was immediately shown. While the German armies mobilized and advanced toward the frontier with amazing swiftness, order, and ease, in the French army all was confusion. In Prussia everything had been for years prepared and orders only had to be taken out of their pigeonholes and dated. In France everything had to be improvised in the midst of unparalleled disorder. Particularly apparent was this in

the case of the reserves. It frequently happened that men living in the east of France must cross to the west and get their arms and uniform, then recross to the east to join their regiments. Not only was time lost, but the railway system was deranged by the crowds of men traveling to and fro for this purpose. Also the trains, thus crowded with soldiers, were prevented from transporting adequate supplies. The French army.

The confusion, the lack of preparation, the defects of the military machine were incredible and were apparent from the very first day. Despatches from corps commanders are all in the same strain. "We need everything," wrote General de Failly on July 19th. "We are in want of everything," telegraphed Bazaine on July 21st. "Everything is completely lacking," announced another a little later. Marshal Lebœuf who, as Minister of War, had declared that everything was ready even to the last button on the last gaiter, soon lost his optimism, and on July 28th telegraphed that his troops could not advance because they lacked bread. Tents were frequently wanting, or there were tents without tent pins. Pots and kettles, medicines for men and for horses, means of transport, wagons, blankets, were frequently lacking. There were cannon without ammunition, horses without harnesses, machine guns without the men who knew how to fire them. Examples might be endlessly multiplied. More, however, are needless to show the chaos that reigned in the French army. Frequently soldiers and even generals went astray, not able to find their places. "Have arrived at Belfort," telegraphed General Michel on July 21st. "Can't find my brigade; can't find the general of the Division. What shall I do? Don't know where my regiments are." It has been observed that this document is probably unique in military records.

But the French were inferior to the Germans in numbers also. They could put into the field hardly 300,000 men, and they had no reserves worth speaking of upon which to The numerical inferiority of the French.

draw. The Germans could put into the field nearly 450,000 men, and had very large reserves which could be gradually made into new armies. Again, on the French side there was confusion in the direction of the forces. The Emperor was very ill, of the disease of which he died three years later, yet, irresolute and feeble, he was at the outset commander-in-chief. During the first two weeks of the war he made three different arrangements concerning the command of the Army of the Rhine.

The Germans invade France.

The French had dreamed of a swift invasion of Germany. Once in central Germany they thought that the South Germans would rise to their aid, that then Austria and Italy would join, and the march to Berlin would begin. Nothing of the sort occurred. Their officers had maps of Germany, which they never needed, few of France. The Germans crossed into Alsace and Lorraine, and between August 6th and September 2nd the French suffered reverse after reverse. On the former day MacMahon was defeated in the battle of Wörth and subsidiary engagements. The French fought bravely and the Germans paid heavily for their success. Nevertheless, it was an unmistakable victory. MacMahon retreated rapidly to the great camp at Châlons, east of Paris.

West of Wörth the Germans defeated the French on the same day (August 6th) at Forbach and Spicheren, and drove the army back toward Metz, one of the strongest fortresses in France. The German armies pressed on, endeavoring to prevent Bazaine, now commander of Metz, from retreating and joining MacMahon. This they succeeded in doing in a series of very bloody battles, Borny, to the east of Metz, on August 14th; Mars-la-Tours, to the west, on August 16th; and Gravelotte, also to the west, on August 18th. The result was that Bazaine, with the principal French army, was bottled up in Metz, surrounded by Germans.

The Emperor, now fearing to return to Paris with these defeats undermining his throne, conceived the unwise plan of having MacMahon's army move from Châlons, eastward,

to the relief of Metz. This it attempted but did not accomplish. On September 1st the battle of Sedan was fought, with the result that the French were surrounded by the Germans. On the next day, September 2nd, the French army surrendered to the Germans. Napoleon himself was taken prisoner of war. The French lost, on September 1st, about 17,000 in killed and wounded, and 21,000 captured by the enemy. On the 2nd over 81,000 officers and men surrendered and became prisoners of war.

The battle of Sedan.

Disasters so appalling resounded throughout the world. France nc longer had an army; one had capitulated at Sedan; the other was locked up in Metz. The early defeats of August had been announced in Paris by the Government as victories. The deception could no longer be maintained. On September 3rd this despatch was received from the Emperor: "The army has been defeated and is captive; I myself am a prisoner." As a prisoner he was no longer head of the government of France; there was, as Thiers said, a "vacancy of power." On Sunday, September 4th, the Legislative Body was convened. But it had no time to deliberate. The mob invaded the hall shouting, "Down with the Empire! Long live the Republic!" Gambetta, Jules Favre and Jules Ferry, followed by the crowd, proceeded to the Hôtel de Ville and there proclaimed the Republic. The Empress fled. A Government of National Defense was organized, with General Trochu at its head, which was the actual government of France during the rest of the war.

The fall of the Empire.

The Franco-German war lasted about six months, from the first of August 1870, when fighting began, to about the first of February 1871. It falls naturally into two periods, the imperial and the republican. During the first, which was limited to the month of August, the regular armies were, as we have seen, destroyed or bottled up. Then the Empire collapsed and the Emperor was a prisoner in Germany. The second period lasted five months. France, under

the Government of National Defense, made a remarkably courageous and spirited defense under the most discouraging conditions.

The Government of National Defense.

The new Government of National Defense, thus improvised, and representing only a spontaneous movement of opinion, never legally sanctioned, was the government of France till the close of the war. It threw all the blame of the war on Napoleon, and declared itself ready for peace; only it would not consent to a peace involving the violation of the territory of France. "Not an inch of our soil will we cede," said Favre, "not a stone of our fortresses." As Germany intended annexations as a result of her victories, this utterance meant that the war must continue.

The Germans, leaving a sufficient army to carry on the siege of Metz, advanced toward Paris. They began the siege of that city on September 19th. This siege, one of the most famous in history, lasted four months, and astonished Europe. Immense stores had been collected in the city, the citizens were armed, and the defense was energetic. The Parisians hoped to hold out long enough to enable new armies to be organized, and diplomacy possibly to intervene. To accomplish the former a delegation from the Government of National Defense, headed by Gambetta, escaped from Paris by balloon, and established a branch seat of government first at Tours, then at Bordeaux. Gambetta, by his immense energy, his eloquence, his patriotism, was able to raise new armies, whose resistance astonished the Germans, but as they had not time to be thoroughly trained, they were unsuccessful. They could not break the immense circle of iron that surrounded Paris. After the overthrow of the Empire the war was reduced to the siege of Paris, and the attempts of these improvised armies to break that siege. These attempts were rendered all the more hopeless by the fall of Metz (October 27, 1870). Six thousand officers and 173,000 men were forced by impending starvation to surrender, with hundreds of cannon and immense

The fall of Metz.

war supplies, the greatest capitulation "recorded in the history of civilized nations." A month earlier, on September 28th, Strassburg had surrendered, and 19,000 soldiers had become prisoners of war.

The capitulation of Metz was particularly disastrous because it made possible the sending of more German armies to reinforce the siege of Paris, and to attack the forces which Gambetta was, by prodigies of effort, creating in the rest of France. These armies could not get to the relief of Paris, nor could the troops within Paris break through to them. The siege became simply a question of endurance.

The siege of Paris.

The Germans began the bombardment of the city early in January. Certain sections suffered terribly, and were ravaged by fires. Famine stared the Parisians in the face. After November 20th there was no more beef or lamb to be had; after December 15th only thirty grammes of horse meat a day per person, which, moreover, cost about two dollars and a half a pound; after January 15th the amount of bread, a wretched stuff, was reduced to 300 grammes. People ate anything they could get, dogs, cats, rats. The market price for rats was two francs apiece. By the 31st of January, there would be nothing left to eat. Additional suffering arose from the fact that the winter was one of the coldest on record. Coal and fire wood were exhausted. Trees in the Champs Elysées and the Bois de Boulogne were cut down, and fires built in the public squares for the poor. Wine froze in casks. On January 28th, with famine almost upon her, Paris capitulated after an heroic resistance. The armistice of Versailles was concluded which really closed the war.

Election of a National Assembly.

The armistice was designed to permit elections to be held throughout France for an assembly that should pronounce upon the question of peace. As peace would involve the cession of French territory to the victors, the Government of National Defense felt that the people of France should themselves decide a matter so vital. Elections were accord-

ingly held on February 8, 1871. The peasants voted overwhelmingly for those favoring peace. As Gambetta, leader of the Republicans, favored war to the bitter end, they voted largely against the republican candidates. Thus the first Assembly, elected under the Third Republic, was composed of a majority of Monarchists, divided into two wings, the Legitimists and the Orleanists, and a minority of Republicans. Only a handful of Bonapartists were chosen, so vast was the disgrace now attached to that name. The Assembly met at Bordeaux, February 12th, and, believing that if France continued the war she might ultimately be annihilated, believing that the fundamental necessity of self-preservation demanded an immediate cessation, voted overwhelmingly for peace.

Thiers chosen Chief of the Executive.

The Government of National Defense now laid down its powers, yielding to the National Assembly. This Assembly chose Thiers as "Chief of the Executive Power," and empowered him to negotiate with Bismarck for peace. The question of the permanent government of France was postponed until a more convenient season. Thiers was now the most popular man in France. He had, in July 1870, done his utmost to prevent France from going to war. He had, during the war, journeyed from one capital of Europe to another, London, St. Petersburg, Vienna, Florence, on a futile diplomatic mission, seeking to win foreign support for France. He was over seventy years of age, but was about to render his most valuable services to France.

Treaty of Frankfort.

The terms of peace granted by Bismarck were extraordinarily severe. They were laid down in the preliminary Peace of Versailles, February 26, 1871. France must pay an indemnity of five thousand million francs ($1,000,000,000) within three years. She must cede Alsace and a large part of Lorraine, including the important fortress of Metz. She was to support a German army of occupation, which should be gradually withdrawn as the instalments of the war indemnity were paid. After much contro-

versy these preliminaries were embodied in the final Treaty of Frankfort, signed May 10, 1871, and ratified by the Assembly of Bordeaux by 433 votes to 98.

Fall of the Temporal Power.

Meanwhile other events had occurred as a result of this war. Italy had completed her unification by seizing the city of Rome, thus terminating the temporal rule of the Pope. The Pope had been supported there by a French garrison. This was withdrawn as a result of the battle of Sedan, and the troops of Victor Emmanuel attacked the Pope's own troops, defeated them after a slight resistance, and entered Rome on the 20th of September 1870. The unity of Italy was now consummated and Rome became the capital of the Kingdom.

Completion of Italian unification.

Completion of German unification.

A more important consequence of the war was the completion of the unification of Germany, and the creation of the present German Empire. Bismarck had desired a war with France as necessary to complete the unity of Germany. Whether necessary or not, at least that end was now secured. After the early German victories, and during the siege of Paris, negotiations were carried on between Prussia and the South German states, looking toward their entrance into the Confederation. In the case of Bavaria and Würtemberg, states of considerable size, concessions had to be made, preserving to them certain powers not retained by the other states. Finally treaties were drawn up and the King of Bavaria, prompted and directed by Bismarck, urged the King of Prussia, in behalf of the princes, to assume the headship of united Germany, and to revive the Empire.

Finally on the 18th of January 1871, surrounded by the princes of Germany and by the generals of the army, King William I was proclaimed German Emperor. This memorable ceremony is one of the supreme ironies of history as it occurred in the Hall of Mirrors, in the palace of Versailles, itself a mighty monument and symbol of the power and pride of Louis XIV, a power which

had been secured to some extent by the humiliation of Germany.

The war of 1866 had resulted in the expulsion of Austria from Germany and from Italy. The war of 1870 completed the unification of both countries. Berlin became the capital of a federal Empire, Rome of a unified Kingdom.

CHAPTER XIV

THE GERMAN EMPIRE

Growth of national feeling in Germany since 1815.

The Franco-German war completed the unification of Germany. That unification was, however, no by-product of a war, no astounding improvisation of a genius in politics and diplomacy. The foundations had been laid before, and the superstructure had been slowly and painfully built up. Many forces had long been co-operating, as we have seen, and had at last converged toward this triumphant issue. Most effective of all was the passion for nationality, which gave to the nineteenth century such elevation of emotion everywhere. But all these factors might have failed of results in the domain of politics had it not been for the rise of a forceful and sagacious statesman to a position of vast power in the Prussian state. How he used that power has been shown.

Constitution of the new German Empire.

The Constitution of the new state was adopted immediately after the close of the war with France, and went into force April 16, 1871. In most respects it is simply the Constitution of the North German Confederation of 1867. The name Confederation gives way to that of Empire, and the name of Emperor is substituted for that of President. But the Empire is a confederation, consisting of twenty-five states, and one imperial territory, Alsace-Lorraine. The King of Prussia is *ipso facto* German Emperor. The Bundesrath and the Reichstag continue, enlarged by the admission of new members from the new states, but with practically the same powers. The Emperor declares war with the consent of the Bundesrath; he makes treaties which, if they concern matters that fall within the sphere of imperial legislation, must be ratified by Parliament. He is head of the army and navy. He is assisted by a Chancellor whom he appoints, and

The Emperor.

whom he removes, who is not responsible to the Parliament but to him alone. Under the Chancellor are various secretaries of state, who simply administer departments, but who do not form a cabinet responsible to Parliament. The Empire is a constitutional monarchy, but not a parliamentary one.

The Bundesrath.

Laws are made by the Bundesrath and the Reichstag. The Bundesrath consists of delegates appointed by the rulers of the different states. The votes of each state, ranging in number from one to seventeen, are cast only as a unit and that according to the instructions of the state government. The Reichstag is the only popular element in the Empire. It consists of 397 members, elected for a term of five years by the voters, that is, men twenty-five years of age or older. The powers of the Reichstag are inferior to those of most of the other popular chambers of Europe. It neither makes nor unmakes ministries. While it, in conjunction with the Bundesrath, votes the appropriations, certain ones, notably those for the army, are voted for a period of years. Its consent is required for new taxes, whereas taxes previously levied continue to be collected without the consent of Parliament being secured again. The matters on which Parliament may legislate are those concerning army, navy, commerce, tariffs, railways, postal system, telegraphs, civil and criminal law. On matters not within the jurisdiction of the Empire each state legislates as it chooses.[1]

The Reichstag.

A confederation of monarchical states.

The German Empire is unique among federal governments in that it is a confederation of monarchical states, which, moreover, are very unequal in size and population, ranging from Prussia with a population of 37,000,000, and covering two-thirds of the territory, down to Schaumburg-Lippe, with a population of 45,000. Three members of the Empire are republics: Lübeck, Bremen, and Hamburg. The rest are monarchies. All have constitutions and legislatures,

[1] The constitution is given in Howard, The German Empire, 403-435, and in Dodd, Modern Constitutions, I, 325-351.

NORTH SEA
DENMARK
Seeland
Fünen
Copenhagen
Malmö
Möen
Falster
Lolland
Langeland
Fehmarn
Kiel
Oldenbg
Neumünster
Lübeck
Rostock
Stralsund
Greifswald
Schleswig-Holstein
Flensburg
Apenrade
Hadersleben
Tondern
Ribe
Esbjerg
Odense
Nyborg
Korsor
Sund
Great Belt
Little Belt
Eider Canal
Kiel Canal
Helgoland to Schlesw.-Holst.
Heligoland
Frederica
Holding
Hamburg
Altona
Harburg
Cuxhaven
Elbe
Weser
Ems
Jade
Wilhelmshaven
Emden
Bremerhaven
Oldenburg
Bremen
Verden
Nienburg
Celle
Lüneburg
Lüneburg Heath
Uelzen
Salzwedel
Stade
Steinhuder
Hanover
Osnabrück
Minden
Lehrte
Brunswick
Wolfsburg
Altmark
Priegnitz
Ludwigslust
Schwerin
Mecklenburg
Güstrow
Wismar
Rostock
Neustrelitz
Pasewalk
Ferdinandshof
Templin
Eberswalde
Spandau
Charlottenbg
Potsdam
Brandenbg
Prov. Brandenburg
Magdeburg
Halberstadt
Oschersleben
Wolmirstedt
Burg
Genthin
Loslau
Anhalt
Dessau
Zerbst
Wittenberg
Bernburg
Köthen
Northausen
Eisleben
Saxony
Halle
Merseburg
Leipzig
Naumburg
Weissenfels
Zeitz
Altenburg
Chemnitz
Zwickau
Plauen
Hof
Karlsbad
Eger
Marienbad
Pilsen
Kulmbach
Coburg
Schweinfurt
Meiningen
Suhl
Ilmenau
Arnstadt
Gotha
Erfurt
Weimar
Jena
Sömmerda
Sondershausen
Nordhausen
Thuringia
Franconia
Bamberg
Bayreuth
Würzburg
Kissingen
Hildburghs.
Saalfeld
Rudolstadt
Arolsen
Cassel
Münden
Hofgeismar
Paderborn
Höxter
Detmold
Lemgo
Bielefeld
Herford
Minden
Osnabrück
Münster
Westphalia
Lippe
Ems
Weser
Diemel
Eder
Fulda
Hesse
Marburg
Giessen
Wetzlar
Siegen
Nassau
Rhine land
Neuwied
Koblenz
Bonn
Cologne
Aachen
Liege
Maastricht
Rhine
Ruhr
Wesel
Duisburg
Dortmund
Bochum
Essen
Gelsenkchn
Barmen
Elberfeld
Düsseldorf
Crefeld
Solingen
Remscheid
Arnheim
Zutphen
Deventer
Zwolle
Amsterdam
Zuider Sea
Groningen
Leeuwarden
Netherlands
West & East Frisian Is
Terschelling
Vlieland
Texel
Wadden Sea
Hamburg
Altona
Harburg
Stade
Cuxhaven
Elbe
Weser
Ems
Jade
Wilhelmshaven
Emden
Bremerhaven
Oldenburg
Bremen
Verden
Nienburg
Celle
Lüneburg
Lüneburg Heath
Uelzen
Salzwedel
Stade
Steinhuder
Hanover
Osnabrück
Minden
Lehrte
Brunswick
Wolfsburg
Altmark
Priegnitz
Ludwigslust
Schwerin
Mecklenburg
Güstrow
Wismar
Rostock
Neustrelitz
Pasewalk
Ferdinandshof
Templin
Eberswalde
Spandau
Charlottenbg
Potsdam
Brandenbg
Prov. Brandenburg
Magdeburg
Halberstadt
Oschersleben
Wolmirstedt
Burg
Genthin
Loslau
Anhalt
Dessau
Zerbst
Wittenberg
Bernburg
Köthen
Northausen
Eisleben
Saxony
Halle
Merseburg
Leipzig
Naumburg
Weissenfels
Zeitz
Altenburg
Chemnitz
Zwickau
Plauen
Hof
Karlsbad
Eger
Marienbad
Pilsen
Kulmbach
Coburg
Schweinfurt
Meiningen
Suhl
Ilmenau
Arnstadt
Gotha
Erfurt
Weimar
Jena
Sömmerda
Sondershausen
Nordhausen
Thuringia
Franconia
Bamberg
Bayreuth
Würzburg
Kissingen
Hildburghs.
Saalfeld
Rudolstadt
Arolsen
Cassel
Münden
Hofgeismar
Paderborn
Höxter
Detmold
Lemgo
Bielefeld
Herford
Minden
Osnabrück
Münster
Westphalia
Lippe
Ems
Weser
Diemel
Eder
Fulda
Hesse
Marburg
Giessen
Wetzlar
Siegen
Nassau
Rhine land
Neuwied
Koblenz
Bonn
Cologne
Aachen
Liege
Maastricht
Rhine
Ruhr
Wesel
Duisburg
Dortmund
Bochum
Essen
Gelsenkchn
Barmen
Elberfeld
Düsseldorf
Crefeld
Solingen
Remscheid
Arnheim
Zutphen
Deventer
Zwolle
Amsterdam
Zuider Sea
Groningen
Leeuwarden
Netherlands
West & East Frisian Is
Terschelling
Vlieland
Texel
Wadden Sea
Luxemburg
Treves
Trier
Moselle
Saar
Luxemburg
Ardennes
Birkenfeld
Kirchheimbolanden
Worms
Mannheim
Ludwigshafen
Heidelberg
Speyer
Bavarian Palatinate
Zweibrücken
Metz
Lorraine
Nancy
Moselle
Luneville
St. Die
Vosges
Alsace
Colmar
Freiburg
Belfort
Mulhausen
Basle
Rhine
Switzerland
Schaffhs.
Constance
Lake Constance
Ravensburg
Lindau
St. Gallen
Werthheim
Tauber
Würzburg
Rothenburg
Ansbach
Jagst
Hall
Heilbronn
Karlsruhe
Rastadt
Neckar
Baden
Stuttgart
Württemberg
Tübingen
Ulm
Danube
Hohenzollern
Nördlingen
Ingolstadt
Wittelsbach
Augsburg
Landshut
Freising
Mühldorf
Munich
Isar
Rottenburg
Passau
Salzburg
Kufstein
Lake Chiem
Ludwig
Erlangen
Fürth
Nuremberg
Ratisbon
Walhalla
Furth
Regen
Danube
Bavaria

THE GERMAN EMPIRE 1910.

Abbreviations:

B.-*Brunswick*
I.-*Lippe.*
R.A.-*Reuss elder Line.*
R.J.-*Reuss younger Line.*
S.A.-*Saxe-Altenburg.*
S.C.G.-*Saxe-Coburg-Gotha.*
S.M.-*Saxe-Meiningen.*
S.W.-*Saxe-Weimar.*
S.L.-*Schaumburg-Lippe*
S.R.-*Schwarzbg-Rudolstadt*
S.S.-*Schwarzburg-Sondershsn*
W.-*Waldeck.*

ALEXANDER II. CZAR OF RUSSIA 1855–1881. THE LIBERATOR OF THE SERFS, AND THE MOST ENLIGHTENED OF THE ROMANOFFS. MURDERED MARCH 13, 1881.

From an engraving by Sart[illegible]

more or less liberal. This confederation differs from other governments of its class in that the states are of unequal voting power in both houses, one state largely preponderating, Prussia, a fact explained by its great size, its population, and the importance of its historic rôle.

Since 1871, Germany has had three Emperors, William I (1871-1888), Frederick III (March 9-June 15, 1888), and William II, since 1888.

Reign of Emperor William I.

The reign of William I, as Emperor, falls into two periods; from 1871 to 1878, a period of internal administrative reforms, and of bitter struggles with the Roman Catholic Church—and from 1878 till 1888, the year of his death, a period characterized by the prominence of economic questions, of protection to industries, of social reforms, and of the acquisition of colonies. During all this time Bismarck was the Emperor's chief minister or Chancellor. Having in nine years made the King, whom he found upon the point of abdicating, the most powerful ruler in Europe, and having given Germans unity, he remained the chief figure in the state twenty years longer until his resignation in 1890.

Bismarck's commanding position.

His position now was one of immense prestige and authority. Much legislation rendered desirable by the new situation was passed in the next few years. Imperial offices were organized. An imperial bureau of railroads was established (1873). In 1873 monometallism was adopted in the place of the confusion of groschen, kreutzer, which hindered trade. New coins were issued, bearing on one side the effigy of the Emperor, and on the other the arms of the Empire—"going to preach to the people the good news of unity." The Imperial Bank was erected in 1875, and, in 1877, elaborate laws on civil and criminal procedure, on bankruptcy, on the judicial organization, and still later, a civil code, were passed. A new system of local government was adopted for cantons, circles, or provinces, whereby the judicial and police authority of the nobility was abolished, and more power was given the voters.

THE KULTURKAMPF

A religious conflict.

No sooner was the new Empire established than it was torn by a fierce religious conflict that lasted many years, the so-called Kulturkampf, or war for civilization, a contest between the State and the Roman Catholic Church. Germany had, since the time of Luther, been divided among the Protestants and Catholics, the Protestants predominating. South German states, Bavaria, Baden, were Catholic. In Prussia, the stronghold of Protestantism, there were two strong Catholic sections, to the east in the Polish provinces, and to the west along the Rhine. Many causes contributed to the fanning of religious passions at this time. By the Prussian Constitution of 1850 almost complete liberty of action and control of organization were granted the Church, which availed itself most energetically of the advantage thus offered. Religious societies, monastic orders, missions, were established widely and conducted an active and uncommonly successful propaganda during the next fifteen years. Prominent among these were the Jesuits. Two classes were alarmed by this progress, the orthodox Protestants, and those devoted to freedom of thought, who dreaded the rise of religious fanaticism as prejudicial to culture.

Causes of the Kulturkampf.

The wars with Austria and France increased the religious disturbance. They were victories by a Protestant state over two strongly Catholic powers. Leadership in Germany had passed from Austria, in Europe from Austria and France, to the principal Protestant nation of the continent, Prussia. In the Seven Weeks' War, the Catholic states, Bavaria, Baden, had sided with Austria. It was widely believed that the French war had been largely occasioned by the Jesuits, working through the Empress Eugénie, and animating her ardent desire to humble the growing Protestant power. Bismarck shared this belief. The loss of the Pope's temporal power just at this time, 1870, embittered Catholics. During the war of 1870 the Archbishop of Posen went to Versailles

to solicit Bismarck's intervention in behalf of the Papacy. He was coldly received. Apparently with the purpose of bringing political pressure to bear upon the Chancellor, a Catholic party was organized at once, the so-called Center, and in the election to the first Imperial Parliament it won sixty-three seats; in the election to the Prussian legislature or Landtag, forty-seven. This party desired the restoration of the temporal power and the independence of the Church. The immediate cause of the conflict was the proclamation by the Vatican Council in 1870 of the new dogma of papal infallibility, the dogma that the Pope can not err "when he defines *ex cathedra*, and in virtue of his apostolic authority any doctrine of faith, or morals," a dogma that shocked Liberals thoroughly penetrated with the modern scientific spirit, and that seemed to politicians to assert that the Pope was superior to all rulers, and had a claim upon the loyalty of the faithful superior to that of their sovereigns.

Formation of the Center Party.

Dogma of Papal Infallibility.

On the promulgation of this dogma a conflict broke out between the Church and the State. In the Vatican Council the German bishops had opposed the new dogma, but had been in the minority. It was now required that all bishops and priests should subscribe to it; the large majority did so, but some refused. A leading opponent was Döllinger, a distinguished professor and theologian. Ordered to explain the dogma in his university of Munich he denied the principles on which it was based. "As a Christian, a theologian, an historian and a citizen, I cannot accept this doctrine," he declared. He was accordingly excommunicated. As an answer to this the university elected him as its Rector. The conflict quickly widened, affecting schools and parishes. The dissidents called themselves Old Catholics, proclaiming their adherence to historic Catholicism, but rejecting merely this addition to their creed as false. These men were excommunicated and deprived of their positions as priests or teachers. People were forbidden to attend worship in churches where they officiated, students to attend

The Old Catholics.

the lectures of such professors. The Old Catholics thereupon appealed to the imperial and state governments for protection. A religious war was shortly in progress, which grew more bitter each year. First the Imperial Parliament forbade the religious orders to engage in teaching; then, in 1872, it expelled the Jesuits from Germany. Of all legislation enacted during this struggle the Falk or May Laws of the Prussian legislature were the most important (passed in May of three successive years, 1873, 1874, 1875). Bismarck supported them on the ground that the contest was political, not religious, that there must be no state within the state, no power considering itself superior to the established authorities. The State must be lay. He also believed that the whole movement was conducted by those opposed to German unity. Anything that imperiled that unity must be crushed. These May Laws gave the State large powers over the education and appointment of the clergy. They forbade the Roman Catholic Church to intervene in any way in civil affairs, or to coerce citizens or officials; they required that all clergymen should pass the regular state examination of the gymnasium, and should study theology for three years at a state university; that all Catholic seminaries should be subject to state inspection. They also established control over the appointment and dismissal of priests. A law was passed making civil marriage compulsory. This was to reduce the power that priests could exercise by refusing to marry a Catholic and a Protestant, and now even Old Catholics. Religious orders were suppressed.

The Falk laws.

Conflict of Church and State.

Against these laws the Catholics indignantly protested. The Pope declared them null and void; the clergy refused to obey them, and the faithful rallied to the support of the clergy. To enforce them the Government resorted to fines, imprisonment, deprivation of salary, expulsion from the country. The conflict spread everywhere, into little villages, as well as into the cities, into the universities

and schools. It dominated politics for several years. In over a thousand parishes in Prussia, all religious services were suspended and churches were closed. There was no priest to baptize or to marry. Eight out of the twelve bishoprics were vacant. One bishop had fled to Austria, another was in hiding in a little village in Holland, and in order to visit his fellow-Catholics at Munich, had disguised himself as a peddler; another, a cardinal, had taken refuge within the Vatican itself. The national life was more and more troubled, and the end was not being accomplished. Indeed, the resistance of the Catholics only stiffened under what they called this "Diocletian persecution." In the elections of 1877 the Center succeeded in returning ninety-two members, and was the largest party in the Reichstag. It was evident that the policy was a failure. Other questions were becoming prominent, of an economic and social character, and Bismarck wished to be free to handle them. Particularly requiring attention, in his opinion, and that of William I, was a new and most menacing party, the Socialist. Bismarck therefore prepared to retreat. The death of Pius IX in 1878, and the election of Leo XIII, a more conciliatory and diplomatic Pope, facilitated the change of policy. From 1878 to 1887 the anti-clerical legislation was in one detail after another abandoned. First the May Laws were suspended, in 1879; then rescinded in 1886; religious orders were permitted to return, with the exception of the Jesuits (1887). Of the various laws only those concerning civil marriage and the civil registration of births and deaths, and the state inspection of schools were left. In return for the measures surrendered Bismarck gained the support of the Center for laws which he now had more at heart.

Bismarck's retreat.

The religious conflict lasted fifteen years, and was acute during five. Its only permanent result was to consolidate and strengthen the Center or Catholic party, which has been ever since the strongest party in this Protestant country.

BISMARCK AND THE POLICY OF PROTECTION

Financial and industrial questions.

In 1879, Bismarck brought about a profound change in the financial and industrial policy of Germany by inducing Parliament to abandon the policy of a low tariff, and comparative free trade, and to adopt a system of high tariff and pronounced protection. His purposes were twofold. He wished to increase the revenue of the Empire and to encourage native industries. The income of the Empire consisted mainly of customs duties. Further funds if necessary were furnished by the several states, their quotas being apportioned according to population. Now the revenue from customs proved insufficient. For some years there had been a deficit, which involved heavier and heavier taxation of the states, to enable them to meet the assessments. If the revenue of the Empire should be increased so that it could meet its own expenses and have a surplus, its political strength would be greatly augmented. For, instead of appealing to the states for contributions, it could distribute the surplus to the states, thus relieving them of taxation for federal purposes; and could also use it as a fund for the social reforms which Bismarck had in mind and which will shortly be described.

Adoption of the policy of protection.

Moreover, Bismarck now desired high tariff duties in order to protect and encourage home industries. In adopting the principle of protection, he was not influenced, he asserted, by the theories of economists, but by his own observation of facts. In his speech of the 2nd of May 1879, in which he introduced his protective policy, he said that he did not propose to discuss protection and free trade in the abstract. He observed that while England was the only nation following the latter policy, France and Austria and Russia and the United States were pronounced adherents of the former, and that it was too much to ask that Germany should permanently remain the dupe of an amiable error. "We have hitherto," he said, "owing to our policy of the

open door been the dumping-ground for the over-production of other countries. It is this, in my opinion, that has depressed prices in Germany, that has prevented the growth of our industries, the development of our economic life. Let us but close the door, let us raise the somewhat higher barrier which I am now proposing, and see to it that at least we preserve for German industry the same market which we are now good-naturedly allowing foreigners to exploit. . . . The fact is that our condition is unsatisfactory and, in my opinion, is worse than that of any of our protectionist neighbors. If the dangers of protection were as great as they are painted by enthusiastic free-traders, France would have been a ruined and impoverished country long ago, because of the theories which she has followed ever since the time of Colbert. . . . For the abstract teachings of science in this connection I care not a straw. I base my opinion on experience, the experience of our own time. I see that protectionist countries are prospering, that free-trade countries are retrograding and that great and powerful England, the mighty athlete, who, having hardened her sinews, stepped out into the open market and said: 'Who will fight me? I am ready for any and all,' even she is gradually returning toward protection, and will in a few years adopt it, in order to keep for herself at least the English market." [1]

Its advantage proved by the history of other nations.

On another occasion Bismarck pointed out that England had adopted free trade only after having given such ample protection to her industries that they were able to outstrip all others in the world. Only then did she dare to issue her challenge. He cited the remarkable development of the United States after "the most gigantic and expensive war of all history," as proof of his contention. "Because it is my deliberate opinion that the prosperity of the United States is chiefly due to her system of protection, I urge that Germany has now reached the point where it is necessary that she follow her example."

Germany should imitate the United States.

[1] Kohl, Die politischen Reden des Fürsten Bismarck, VIII, 11-32.

Bismarck won the day, though not without difficulty. Germany entered upon a period of protection, which, growing higher and applied to more and more industries, has continued ever since. Bismarck believed that Germany must become rich in order to be strong; that she could only become rich by manufactures; and that she could have manufactures only by giving them protection. The system was worked out gradually and piecemeal, as he could not carry his whole plan at once. By means of the tariff Bismarck wished to assure Germans the home market. Not only has that been largely accomplished, but by its means the foreign market also has been widened. Through offering concessions to foreign nations for concessions from them, Germany has gained for her manufactured products an entrance into many other countries, which was denied them before. The prodigious expansion of German industry after 1880 is regarded as a vindication of this policy.

The system gradually applied.

BISMARCK AND SOCIALISM

The growth of Socialism.

In 1878 Bismarck turned his attention to the Socialist party which had for some time been growing, and now seemed menacing. That party was founded by Ferdinand Lassalle, a Socialist of 1848, much influenced by the French school of that day. The party, originally appearing in 1848, was shortly broken up by persecution and did not reappear until 1863. In 1865 Lassalle founded a journal called the Social Democrat. In opposition to this party a somewhat different Socialist group was led by Karl Marx. These two were rivals until 1875, when a fusion was effected and the party platform was adopted at Gotha. In 1871 the Socialists elected two members to the Reichstag, three years later their representation increased to nine, and in 1877 to twelve. The Socialist votes polled in the first ordinary returns were: in 1871, 124,655 out of a total of 3,892,160; 1874, 351,952 out of 5,190,254; and 1877, 493,288 out of 5,401,021.

The steady growth of this party aroused the alarm of the

ruling classes of Germany, and, as its aims were revolutionary and destructive of the entire existing order, it was a more serious enemy than the Center and Ultramontane party. William I regarded Socialism as his personal enemy, and considered himself commissioned by God to combat it. Bismarck had never yet proposed any comprehensive programme against it, but he had long hated the party, as was natural, considering his training and environment, and considering also the declarations of the Socialists themselves. Their leaders, Liebknecht and Bebel, had opposed the North German Confederation, the war with France, the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine. The Socialists expressed openly and freely their entire opposition to the existing order in Germany. It was only a question of time when they must clash violently with the man who had helped so powerfully to create that order, and whose life-work henceforth was to consolidate it. Again, the Socialist party was radically democratic, and Bismarck hated democracy. A conflict between men representing the very opposite poles of opinion was inevitable. The occasion came in 1878, when two attempts were made upon the life of the aged Emperor, the first on May 11th, and the second on June 2nd, the latter proving very serious. These attempts upon the life of a man who was their hero horrified and angered the people. The would-be assassins had acted of their own motion, but they were Socialists. The Socialists denounced their acts, nevertheless public opinion held them responsible. Bismarck determined to use this opportunity to crush them once for all. He would use two methods, one stern repression of Socialist agitation, the other amelioration of the conditions of the working class, conditions which alone, he believed, caused them to listen to the false and deceptive doctrines of the Socialist leaders.

Alarm of the ruling classes.

Attempts upon the life of the Emperor.

First came repression. In October 1878 a law of great severity, intended to stamp out completely all Socialist propaganda, was passed by the Imperial Parliament. It

Severe measures against the Socialists.

forbade all associations, meetings and publications having for their object "the subversion of the social order," or in which "socialistic tendencies" should appear. It gave the police large powers of interference, arrest, and expulsion from the country. Martial law might be proclaimed where desirable, which meant that, as far as Socialists were concerned, the ordinary courts would cease to protect individual liberties. Practically a mere decree of a police official sufficed to expel from Germany any one suspected or accused of being a Socialist. This law was enacted for a period of four years. It was later twice renewed and remained in force until 1890. It was vigorously applied. According to statistics furnished by the Socialists themselves, 1400 publications were suppressed, 1500 persons were imprisoned, 900 banished, during these twelve years. One might not read the works of Lassalle, for instance, even in a public library.

This law, says a biographer of Bismarck, is very disappointing. "We find the Government again having recourse to the same means for checking and guarding opinion which Metternich had used fifty years before."[1] It was, moreover, an egregious failure. For twelve years the Socialists carried on their propaganda in secret. It became evident that their power lay in their ideas and in the economic conditions of the working classes, rather than in formal organizations, which might be broken up. A paper was published for them in Switzerland and every week thousands of copies found their way into the hands of workingmen in Germany, despite the utmost vigilance of the police. Persecution in their case, as in that of the Roman Catholics, only rendered the party more resolute and active. At first it seemed that the law would realize the aims of its sponsors, for in the elections of 1881, the first after its passage, the Socialist vote fell from about 493,000 to about 312,000. But in 1884 it rose to 549,000; in 1887 to 763,000; in 1890 to 1,427,000, resulting in the election of thirty-five members to

Their failure.

Continued growth of the Socialist party.

[1] Headlam, Bismarck, 409.

the Reichstag. In that year the laws were not renewed. The Socialists came out of their contest with Bismarck with a popular and a parliamentary vote increased threefold.

But Bismarck had at no time intended to rest content with merely repressive measures. He had purposed from the beginning to effect such sweeping reforms in the conditions of the working classes that they would see that the State was their true benefactor, and would rally around it, leaving the Socialist party stranded and with no further reason for existence. In the very year 1878 he said in the Reichstag, "I will further every endeavor which positively aims at improving the condition of the working classes," and he promised to consider "any positive proposal" coming from the Socialists "for fashioning the future in a sensible way." In this he and Emperor William I were in entire accord, as they had not been in the Kulturkampf. The Emperor in opening the Reichstag in 1879, said, "A remedy cannot alone be sought in the repression of socialistic agitation; there must be simultaneously the positive advancement of the welfare of the working classes. And here the case of those work-people who are incapable of earning their own livelihood is of the greatest importance." Two years later (March 8, 1881) he said, "That the State should interest itself to a greater degree than hitherto in those of its members who need assistance, is not only a duty of humanity and Christianity—by which state institutions should be permeated—but a duty of state-preserving policy, whose aim should be to cultivate the conception—and that, too, among the non-propertied classes, which form at once the most numerous and the least instructed part of the population—that the State is not merely a necessary but a benevolent institution. These classes must, by the evident and direct advantages which are secured to them by legislative measures, be led to regard the State, not as an institution contrived for the protection of the better classes of society,

The Imperial Government undertakes social reform.

but as one serving their own needs and interests."[1] Bismarck said in 1884: "The whole matter centers in the question: Is it the duty of the state, or is it not, to provide for its helpless citizens? I maintain that it is its duty, that it is the duty not only of the Christian state . . . but of every state."[2]

Various forms of insurance proposed.

The method by which Bismarck proposed to improve the condition of the working class was by an elaborate and comprehensive system of insurance against the misfortunes and vicissitudes of life, against sickness, accident, old age and incapacity. It was his desire that any workingman incapacitated in any of these ways should not be exposed to the possibility of becoming a pauper, but should receive a pension from the state. His policy was called State Socialism. "Give the workingman the right to employment as long as he has health," he told the Reichstag, "assure him care when he is sick, and maintenance when he is old. If you will do that without fearing the sacrifice, or crying out 'State Socialism' as soon as the words 'provision for old age' are uttered . . . then I believe these gentlemen (the Socialists) will sound their bird call in vain; and as soon as the workingmen see that the Government is deeply interested in their welfare, the flocking to them will cease."

State Socialism.

The measures carried.

Bismarck's proposals met with vehement opposition, both in the Reichstag and among influential classes outside. It was only slowly that he carried them through, the Sickness Insurance Law in 1883, the Accident Insurance Laws in 1884 and 1885, and the Old Age Insurance Law in 1889. These laws are very complicated and cannot be described here at length.

Bismarck wished to have the state bear the entire expense. He did not wish to have it come as an additional burden to the working people. But he was not able to secure the consent of the Reichstag, which gave as reasons for its op-

[1] Dawson, Bismarck and State Socialism, 111.
[2] Ibid., 118.

position the enormous amount of money required, the great centralization of power in the hands of the Government which would arise from a system requiring so many officials and handling such large sums, and the weakening of the sense of self-reliance and personal responsibility with the workingmen.

As finally enacted in the case of accident insurance the employers bear the burden alone. The employer is obliged by law to insure his employees, entirely at his own expense. In the case of sickness insurance, as a rule, the employer must pay one-third and the employee two-thirds of the premium, and in the case of the old age and incapacity insurance, the premiums are paid by the employers, the employees, and to some extent, by the state.

Bismarck a pioneer.

Such was Bismarck's contribution to the solution of the social question, which grew to such commanding importance as the nineteenth century wore on. In this legislation Bismarck was a pioneer. His ideas have been studied widely in other countries, and his example followed in some. Dawson calls him "the first social reformer of the century." Bismarck, once charged with changing his opinions to meet the occasion, replied that he had frequently changed his opinions. "But I have been faithful to this: the unification of Germany under the leadership of Prussia. Everything else is accessory." That this system of state insurance, by relieving the mental and physical distress of millions of German laborers would strengthen the Empire, as well as benefit humanity, was, in his opinion, an additional reason for its adoption.

Not supported by the Socialists.

The Socialists did not co-operate with him in the passage of these laws, which they denounced as entirely inadequate to solve the social evils, as only a slight step in the right direction. Nor did Bismarck wish their support. They were Social Democrats. Democracy he hated. Socialism of the state, controlled by a powerful monarch, was one thing. Socialism carried through by the people believing in a democratic government, opposed to the existing order

in government and society, a very different thing. At the very moment that Bismarck secured the passage of the Accident Insurance Bill he also demanded the renewal of the law against the Socialists. His prophecy, that if these laws were passed the Socialists would sound their bird call in vain, has not been fulfilled. That party has grown greatly and almost uninterruptedly ever since he began his war upon it.

ACQUISITION OF COLONIES

The beginning of a colonial empire.

One of the important features of the closing years of Bismarck's political career was the beginning of a German colonial empire. In his earlier years Bismarck did not believe in Germany's attempting the acquisition of colonies. In 1871 he refused to demand as prize of war any of the French colonial possessions. He believed that Germany should consolidate, and should not risk incurring the hostility of other nations by entering upon the path of colonial rivalry. But colonies, nevertheless, were being founded under the spirit of private initiative. Energetic merchants from Hamburg and Bremen established trading stations in Africa, and the islands of the Pacific, for the purpose of selling their goods and acquiring tropical products, such as cocoa, coffee, rubber, spices. The aid of the Government was invoked at various times, but Bismarck held aloof. The interest aroused in the exploits of these private companies gave rise towards 1880 to a definite colonial party and the formation of a Colonial Society, which has since become important.

A result of the adoption of the policy of protection.

The change in the policy of the Government, however, from one of aloofness to one of energetic participation and acquisition of colonies was largely a result of the adoption of the policy of protection and active governmental encouragement of manufactures and commerce. In the debate on the tariff bill of 1879 Bismarck said that it was desirable to protect manufactures, that thus a greater demand for labor would arise, that more people could live in Germany,

and that therefore the emigration which had for years drawn tens of thousands from the country, particularly to the United States, would be decreased. But to develop manufactures to the utmost, Germany must have new markets for her products; and here colonies would be useful. In 1884 he adopted a vigorous colonial policy, supporting and expanding the work of the private merchants and travelers. In that year Germany seized a number of points in Africa, in the southwest, the west, and the east. A period of diplomatic activity began, leading in the next few years to treaties with England and other powers, resulting in the fixing of the boundaries of the various claimants to African territory. This is the partition of Africa described elsewhere.[1] Germany thus acquired a scattered African empire of great size, consisting of Kamerun, Togoland, German Southwest Africa, German East Africa; also a part of New Guinea. Later some of the Samoan islands came into her possession, and in 1899 she purchased the Caroline and the Ladrone islands, excepting Guam, from Spain for about four million dollars.

Energetic intervention in Africa.

The German colonies.

THE TRIPLE ALLIANCE

While domestic affairs formed the chief concern of Bismarck after the war with France, yet he followed the course of foreign affairs with the same closeness of attention that he had shown before, and manipulated them with the same display of subtlety and audacity that had characterized his previous diplomatic career. His great achievement in diplomacy in these years was the formation of the Triple Alliance, an achievement directed, like all the actions of his career, toward the consolidation and exaltation of his country. The origin of this alliance is really to be found in the Treaty of Frankfort, which sealed the humiliation of France. The wresting from France of Alsace and Lorraine inevitably rendered that country desirous of a war of

The Triple Alliance.

[1] See Chapter XXIII.

revenge, of a war for their recovery. This has remained the open sore of Europe since 1871. Firmly resolved to keep what he had won, Bismarck's chief consideration was to render such a war hopeless, therefore, perhaps, impossible.

Isolation of France.

France must be isolated so completely that she would not dare to move. This was accomplished, first by the friendly understanding brought about by Bismarck between the three rulers of eastern Europe, the Emperors of Germany, Russia, and Austria. But this understanding was shattered by events in the Balkan peninsula during the years from 1876 to 1878. In the Balkans, Russia and Austria were rivals, and their rivalry was thrown into high relief at the Congress of Berlin. Russia, unaided, had carried on a war with Turkey, and had imposed the Treaty of San Stefano upon her conquered enemy, only to find that Europe would not recognize that treaty, but insisted upon its revision at an international congress, and at that congress she found Bismarck, to whom she had rendered inestimable services in the years so critical for Prussia, from 1863 to 1870, now acting as the friend of Austria, a power which had taken no part in the conflict, but was now intent upon drawing chestnuts from the fire with the aid of the Iron Chancellor. The Treaty of Berlin was a humiliation for Russia and a striking success for Austria, her rival, which was now empowered to "occupy" Bosnia and Herzegovina. No wonder that the Russian Chancellor, Gortchakoff, pronounced the Congress of Berlin "the darkest episode in his career," and that Alexander II declared that "Bismarck had forgotten his promises of 1870." By favoring one of his allies Bismarck had alienated the other. In this fact lay the germ of the two great international combinations of the future, the Triple and Dual Alliances, factors of profound significance in the recent history of Europe.

Of these the first in order of creation and in importance was the Triple Alliance. Realizing that Russia was mor-

tally offended at his conduct, and that the friendly understanding with her was over, Bismarck turned for compensation to a closer union with Austria, and concluded a treaty with her October 7, 1879. This treaty provided that if either Germany or Austria were attacked by Russia the two should be bound "to lend each other reciprocal aid with the whole of their military power, and, subsequently, to conclude no peace except conjointly and in agreement"; that if either Germany or Austria should be attacked by another power—as, for instance, France—the ally should remain neutral, but that if this enemy should be aided by Russia, then Germany and Austria should act together with their full military force, and should make peace in common. Thus this Austro-German Treaty of 1879 established a defensive alliance aimed particularly against Russia, to a lesser degree against France. The treaty was secret and was not published until 1887. Meanwhile, in 1882, Italy joined the alliance, irritated at France because of her seizure the year before of Tunis, which Italy herself coveted as a seat for colonial expansion. Thus was formed the Triple Alliance. The text of that alliance has never been published, but its purpose and character may be derived from that of the Austro-German alliance, which was now merely expanded to include another power. The alliance was made for a period of years, but has been constantly renewed and is still in force. It is a defensive alliance, designed to assure its territory to each of the contracting parties.

Austro-German Treaty of 1879.

Entrance of Italy into the alliance.

Thus was created a combination of powers which dominated central Europe, from the Baltic to the Mediterranean, and which rested on a military force of over two million men. At its head stood Germany. Europe entered upon a period of German leadership in international affairs which was later to be challenged by the rise of a new alliance, that of Russia and France, which for various reasons, however, was slow in forming.

THE REIGN OF WILLIAM II

Death of William I. On the 9th of March, 1888, Emperor William I died at the age of ninety-one. He was succeeded by his son, Frederick III, in his fifty-seventh year. The new Emperor was a man of moderation, of liberalism in politics, an admirer of the English constitution. It is supposed that, had he lived, the autocracy of the ruler would have given way to a genuine parliamentary system like that of England, and that an era of greater liberty would have been inaugurated. But he was already a dying man, ill of cancer of the throat. His reign was one of physical agony patiently borne. Unable to use his voice, he could only indicate his wishes by writing or by signs. The reign was soon over, before the era of liberalism had time to dawn. Frederick was King and Emperor only from March 9 to June 15, 1888.

Accession of William II. He was succeeded by his son, William II, the present Emperor. The new ruler was twenty-nine years of age, a young man of very active mind, of fertile imagination, versatile, ambitious, self-confident, a man of unusual promise. His education had been thorough and intelligent. In politics he was without experience. In his earliest utterances he showed his enthusiasm for the army and for religious orthodoxy. He held the doctrine of the divine origin of his power with medieval fervor, expressing it with frequency and in dramatic fashion. It was evident that a man of such a character would wish to govern, and not simply reign. He would not be willing long to efface himself behind the imposing figure of the great Chancellor. Bismarck had prophesied that the Emperor would be his own Chancellor, yet he did not have the wisdom to resign when the old Emperor died, and to depart with dignity. He clung to power. From the beginning friction developed between the two. They thought differently, felt differently. The fundamental question was, who should rule in Germany? The struggle was for supremacy since there was no way

in which two persons so self-willed and autocratic could divide power. As Bismarck stayed on when he saw that his presence was no longer desired, the Emperor, not willing to be overshadowed by so commanding and illustrious a minister, finally demanded his resignation in 1890. Thus in bitterness and humiliation ended the political career of a man who, according to Bismarck himself, had "cut a figure in the history of Germany and Prussia." He lived several years longer, dying in 1898 at the age of eighty-three, leaving as his epitaph, "A faithful servant of Emperor William I." Thus vanished from view a man who will rank in history as one of the few great founders of states.

The resignation of Bismarck.

Since 1890 the personality of William II has been the decisive factor in the state. His Chancellors have been, in fact as well as in theory, his servants, carrying out the master's wish. There have been four: Caprivi, 1890-1894; Hohenlohe, 1894-1900; von Bülow, 1900-1909; and Bethmann-Hollweg since July, 1909.

The Anti-Socialist policy abandoned

The extreme political tension was at first somewhat relieved by the removal of Bismarck from the scene. The early measures under the new régime showed a liberal tendency. The Anti-Socialist laws, expiring in 1890, were not renewed. This had been one of the causes of friction between the Emperor and the Chancellor. Bismarck wished them renewed, and their stringency increased. The Emperor wished to try milder methods, hoping to undermine the Socialists completely by further measures of social and economic amelioration, to kill them with kindness. The repressive laws lapsing, the Socialists reorganized openly, and have conducted an aggressive campaign ever since. The Emperor, soon recognizing the futility of anodynes, became their bitter enemy, and began to denounce them vehemently, but no new legislation has been passed against them, although several times attempted.

In commercial matters William II, without abandoning the policy of protection, has made many reciprocity treaties

Remarkable expansion of German industry.

with other nations, aiming to gain larger markets for the products of German manufacture, and his reign has been notable for the remarkable expansion of industry and commerce, which has rendered Germany the redoubtable rival of England and the United States. In colonial and foreign affairs an aggressive policy has been followed. German colonies as yet have little importance, have entailed great expense and have yielded only small returns. But the desire for a great colonial empire has become a settled policy of the Government, and has seized the popular imagination, as was shown in the last elections, those of 1907. In that year the Socialists having opposed the policy of the Government in Southwest Africa, the Reichstag was dissolved, with the result that, for the first time in many years, they lost greatly in the number of representatives elected by them to the Reichstag. Their numbers fell from eighty-one to forty-three, but their popular vote was larger than ever by about a quarter of a million.

Germany a naval power.

Connected with the growing interest of Germany in commercial and colonial affairs has gone an increasing interest in the navy. Strong on land for fifty years, William II desires that Germany shall be strong on the sea, that she may act with decision in any part of the world, that her diplomacy, which is permeated with the idea that nothing great shall be done in world politics anywhere, in Europe, in Asia, in Africa, without her consent, may be supported by a formidable navy. To make that fleet powerful has been a constant and is a growing preoccupation of the present sovereign.

Continued growth of Socialism.

In the political world the rise of the Social Democratic party is the most important phenomenon. It represents not merely a desire for a revolution in the economic sphere, it also represents a protest against the autocratic government of the present ruler, a demand for radically democratic institutions. While Germany has a Constitution and a Parliament, the monarch is vested with vast power.

Parliament does not control the Government, as the ministers are not responsible to it. There is freedom of speech in Parliament, but practically during most of this reign it has not existed outside. Hundreds of men have, during the past twenty years, been imprisoned for such criticisms of the Government as in other countries are the current coin of discussion. This is the crime of *lèse-majesté*, which, as long as it exists, prevents a free political life. The growth of the Social Democratic party to some extent represents mere liberalism, not adherence to the economic theory of the Socialists. It is the great reform and opposition party of Germany. It has the largest popular vote of any party, 3,250,000. Yet the Conservatives with less than 1,500,000 votes elected in 1907 eighty-three members to the Reichstag to the forty-three of the Socialists. The reason is this. The electoral districts have not been altered since they were originally laid out in 1869-71, though population has vastly shifted from country to city. The cities have grown rapidly since then, and it is in industrial centers that the Socialists are strongest. Berlin with a population in 1871 of 600,000, had six members in the Reichstag. It still has only that number, though its population is over two million, and though it would be entitled to twenty members if equal electoral districts were granted. These the Socialists demand, a demand which, if granted, would make them the most powerful party in the Reichstag, as they are in the popular vote. For this very reason the Government has thus far refused the demand. The extreme opponents of the Social Democrats even urge that universal suffrage, guaranteed by the Constitution, be abolished, as the only way to crush the party. To this extreme the Government has not yet gone.

The Social Democratic party numerically the largest.

At the present time several questions are important. One of these is the greatly increased taxation rendered necessary, owing largely to the elaborate and costly naval programme which has been adopted, and which includes

the building annually, for several years to come, of four *Dreadnoughts*.

The demand for electoral reform.

Three other questions are political: the question of the electoral reform in Prussia; of the redistribution of seats, both in the Prussian Landtag and the Imperial Reichstag; and of ministerial responsibility.

The Prussian electoral system is that of the three classes previously described.[1] According to this a man's voting power is determined by the amount of his taxes. Voters are divided into three groups, according to taxes paid, and each group has an equal representation in the assemblies or colleges that choose the deputies to the lower house of the Prussian legislature. The first class contains from three to five per cent of the voters, the second from ten to twelve, whereas the third class contains perhaps eighty-five per cent, yet has only one-third of the members of the colleges. The result is, as has been said, representation in the Chamber of Deputies only for the rich and well-to-do. The working classes are almost entirely unrepresented. Because of this method of indirect elections, down to 1908 the Socialists were unable to elect a single member to the Prussian Chamber. With direct election they would have been entitled to about a hundred seats.

The demand for parliamentary reform.

Again, the electoral districts for the Prussian Chamber have not been changed since 1860. There are therefore great inequalities between them. Thus in the province of East Prussia the actual number of inhabitants to each deputy is 63,000, while in Berlin it is 170,000. The demand is growing that many districts be partially or wholly disfranchised or merged with others, and that other districts receive a larger representation.

In the Empire a similar problem is yearly becoming more acute. In 1871 Germany was divided into 397 constituencies for the Reichstag. The number has remained the same ever since, nor has a single district gained or lost in represen-

See page 186.

tation. Yet during that time the population of the Empire has increased from about forty-one millions to over sixty millions, and there has been a great shifting in population from the country to the cities. One of the divisions of Berlin, with a population of 697,000, elects one representative, whereas the petty principality of Waldeck, with a population of 59,000, elects one. The 851,000 voters of Greater Berlin return eight members; the same number of voters in fifty of the smaller constituencies return forty-eight. A reform of these gross inequalities is widely demanded.

The demand for ministerial responsibility.

Another subject which has recently received great emphasis is that concerning ministerial responsibility. The indiscretions of Emperor William II have made this one of the burning questions. An interview with him, in which he spoke with great freedom of the strained relations between Germany and Great Britain, was published in the London *Telegraph* on October 28, 1908. At once was seen a phenomenon not witnessed in Germany since the founding of the Empire. There was a violent popular protest against the irresponsible actions of the Emperor, actions subject to no control, and yet easily capable of bringing about a war. Newspapers of all shades of party affiliation displayed a freedom of utterance and of censure unparalleled in Germany. All parties in the Reichstag expressed their emphatic disapproval. The incident was not sufficient to bring about the introduction of the system of the responsibility of the ministers for all the acts of the monarch, and the control of the ministry by the majority of the Parliament—in short, the parliamentary system in its essential feature. But it will probably prove to have brought Germany considerably nearer to that system, through which the voters of a country have the supreme authority in the state.

The great industrial expansion of Germany has created a numerous and wealthy bourgeoisie and an immense labor class. In other countries the advent of the bourgeoisie has been followed by liberal and democratic reforms, as in

France at the close of the eighteenth century. This class is now strong in Germany. An autocratic government may favor its development, in which case it will be submissive; but if by indiscreet or wilful acts the monarch threatens the material welfare of a class powerful by reason of its wealth and intelligence, the instinct of that class has been to seek to curb the power of the individual, to seize control of the state. And one of its strongest weapons has hitherto been an appeal to the sovereignty of the people. Whether such a turn in the evolution of Germany is impending only the future can show. It is enough here merely to indicate what appears to be the most significant feature of the present situation. Whether the people will gain in power, as they have gained in other countries, or lose even the portion they now have, remains to be seen. At present they count for less politically in Germany than in the other countries of western Europe.

The present situation.

CHAPTER XV

FRANCE UNDER THE THIRD REPUBLIC

We have seen that the Republic was proclaimed by the Parisians September 4, 1870, as a result of the defeats of the Empire in the Franco-German war, culminating at Sedan. Immediately a Provisional Government of National Defense assumed control. In all this there was no appeal to the people of France, no ratification by them. This Government gave way in February 1871 to a National Assembly of 750 members, elected by universal suffrage for the purpose of making peace with Germany. It was felt that the Provisional Government, not popularly chosen, but the creation of a Parisian insurrection, was not competent to settle so grave a matter, involving, as it necessarily would, the cession of territory to the Germans. This National Assembly, which first met at Bordeaux, showed a majority of Monarchists. The reason was that as Gambetta and the leading Republicans wished to continue the war, and as the mass of peasants wished peace, the latter voted for the opponents of Gambetta, who were chiefly Monarchists. There is no evidence to show that in doing this the peasants were expressing an opinion against the Republic as a form of government and in favor of a Monarchy. They wished the war stopped, and took the most obvious means to that end. The Assembly of Bordeaux made the peace, ceding Alsace and Lorraine, and assuming the enormous war indemnity. But peace did not return to France as a result of the Treaty of Frankfort. The "Terrible Year," as the French call it, of 1870-71 had more horrors in store. Civil war followed the war with the foreigners, shorter, but exceeding it in ferocity, a war between the city of Paris and the Government of France, represented by the Assembly of Bor-

The National Assembly.

deaux. That Assembly had, as we have seen, chosen Thiers as "chief of the executive power," pending "the nation's decision as to the definitive form of government." Thus the fundamental question was postponed. Thiers was chosen for no definite term; he was the servant of the Assembly to carry out its wishes, and might be dismissed by it at any moment.

THE COMMUNE

Paris and the Assembly mutually suspicious.

Between the Government and the people of Paris serious disagreements immediately arose, which led quickly to the war of the Commune. Paris had proclaimed the Republic. But the Republic was not yet sanctioned by France, and existed only *de facto*. On the other hand, the National Assembly was controlled by Monarchists, and it had postponed the determination of the permanent institutions of the country. Did not this simply mean that it would abolish the Republic and proclaim the Monarchy, when it should judge the moment propitious? This fear, only too well justified, that the Assembly was hostile to the Republic, was the fundamental cause of the Commune. Paris lived in daily dread of this event. Paris was ardently Republican. For ten years under the Empire it had been returning Republicans to the Chamber of Deputies. These men did not propose to let a coup d'état like that of Louis Napoleon in 1851 occur again. Various acts of the Assembly were well adapted to deepen and intensify the feeling of dread uncertainty. The Assembly showed its distrust of Paris by

Versailles declared the capital.

voting in March 1871 that it would henceforth sit in Versailles. In other words, a small and sleepy town, and one associated with the history of Monarchy, was to be the capital of France instead of the great city which had sustained the tremendous siege and by her self-sacrifice and suffering had done her best to hold high the honor of the land. Not only was Paris wounded in her pride by this act which showed such unmistakable suspicion of her, but

she suffered also in her material interests at a time of great financial distress. Property-owners, merchants, workmen were affected by this decision, which really removed the capital from Paris. The prosperity of Paris, sadly undermined by the war with the Germans, now received an additional blow from the Government of France.

Other highly imprudent acts of the Assembly tended in the same direction. The payment of rents, debts, notes falling due, had been suspended during the siege. The Parisians wished this suspension prolonged until business should revive. The Assembly refused to grant this, but ordered the payment of all such debts to be made within forty-eight hours. The result was that within four days 150,000 Parisians found themselves exposed to legal prosecution because of inability to pay their debts. This meant immense hardship to the business world.

Distress of the working classes.

Again, the majority of workingmen still without employment had as their only means of support their pay as members of the National Guard. This was now suppressed by the Assembly, except for those supplied with certificates of poverty. The economic misery of large numbers was thus increased at the very time they needed relief, after the harrowing siege. The National Guard included most of the able-bodied male population of the city. It had defended the city during the siege, and its arms were left in its hands after the peace. As soon as the siege was raised the rich and well-to-do members of the Guard left Paris in large numbers, perhaps 150,000 of them, to rejoin their families in the provinces and abroad. The poor remained, perforce, without work, and now in most instances deprived of their franc and a half a day—an immense mass of discontented men, wretched, suspicious, armed, and inflamed by every rumor that the Republic was in danger.

Revolutionary elements.

There was also in Paris a considerable population having diverse revolutionary tendencies—Anarchists, Jacobins, Socialists. The last party had grown under the reign of Na-

poleon III, and had a large following among the working classes. Among the restless, discontented, poverty-stricken masses of the great city their leaders worked with success. There arose out of the confusion of the time the idea of the commune, or the individual unit of the nation, the city, or the village. It was held that in the future government of France emphasis should be given to the commune, that it should be vested with large powers to exercise as it saw fit, that the rôle of the state as a whole should be circumscribed. Looked at in one light this was the old idea that France was too highly centralized, local government too limited, too much controlled by the state. Let France be decentralized, was the cry. Each commune should be largely independent, uncontrolled in most matters by the central government. Such a scheme had this connection with the situation of the hour: it would free the cities, most of which were republican, in great measure from the control of the central government, which in the Assembly was monarchical. It would also be of advantage to the Socialists, who aspired to invest the commune with extensive powers in order that they might be used to bring about in each unit an economic and social revolution. Thus the radical Republicans, suspicious of the Assembly and prone to believe that the Republic was in danger, and a revolutionary party influenced by Socialists and inciting the people of the crowded workingmen's quarters to revolt, both emphasized the importance of the commune.

The idea of the commune.

It was through the National Guard that this confused discontent gained expression. The Guard chose in February 1871 a committee of sixty to direct it, and to prevent any action against Paris and against the Republic on the part of the National Assembly. It removed some cannon to one of the strongest points in the city. The Government, believing an insurrection likely, and not willing to strengthen it by leaving the cannon in the hands of the disaffected, endeavored to seize them on March 18, 1871, but failed.

The National Guard.

The National Guard protected them; popular defiance of the Government had begun. The insurrectionary spirit spread with great rapidity throughout Paris until it developed into a war between Paris and the Versailles Government. Two of the generals of the latter were seized and shot by the insurgents. The Government forces were withdrawn from Paris by Thiers, and the city was left entirely in the hands of the insurgents.

The government of the commune.

This action of the national government left a free field for the insurgents in the city. The more radical element now secured complete control. An election was held in Paris on March 26th of a General Council of 90 members to serve as the government of the commune. This government, commonly called the Commune, organized itself by appointing ministers or heads of various departments. It adopted the republican calendar of the Revolution, and the red flag of the Socialists. This government consisted of revolutionists, but the revolutionists differed widely and bitterly from each other, and in these divisions lay their weakness and the cause of their ultimate overthrow. The ideal of the new government, as announced to the people, was the decentralization of France. The central government should simply consist of delegates from the communes. France was to be a kind of federation of these local units. The Communists vehemently denounced as a slander that they were seeking to destroy the unity of France, as worked out by the French Revolution: they were simply trying to abolish the kind of unity "imposed on us up to this day by the Empire, the Monarchy, and Parliamentarism," which had been but "despotic, unintelligent, arbitrary, and onerous centralization." They wished by the new and free and spontaneous unity of the communes, co-operating voluntarily, to abolish the old system of "militarism, officialism, exploitation, stockjobbing, monopolies, and privileges to which the proletariat owes its servitude, and the fatherland its misfortunes and its disasters." They appealed to France to join them. "Let her

be our ally in this conflict, which can only end by the triumph of the communal idea or the ruin of Paris!" [1]

The Commune and the National Assembly clash.

This government and this ideal did not succeed, as success depended on defeating the Versailles Government. Troops were sent out from Paris to break up the National Assembly in Versailles, but they failed, their leaders were seized and shot on the spot. The Commune in revenge ordered the arrest of many prominent men in Paris, who were to be kept as "hostages."

To Thiers and the National Assembly the whole affair was infamous. It imperiled the very existence of France. It was a bold and unscrupulous attempt of a single city to defy all France, the more infamous as foreign troops were still in control of the country. For Frenchmen to defy the Government of France, to begin civil war in the presence of the victorious Germans, was bitterly humiliating to the nation before all the world. Some attempts at bringing about a reconciliation were made, but failed. Thiers, to disarm the cry that the Republic was in danger, denied that the Government was preparing to destroy the Republic, flatly contradicted the Communist leaders—"they are lying to France"—and announced that if any such conspiracy existed anywhere he would not lend himself to its execution, and a law was passed, April 14th, enlarging the powers of local governing bodies. But he was emphatic that the unity of France must be preserved, and it was clear that the only way to do this was to put down the insurgents of Paris. This was for some time impossible, as the Assembly had few troops, and those were demoralized. But with the return of soldiers from Switzerland and from Germany, an army of 150,000 men was gotten together. With this army a regular siege of Paris was begun, this time by Frenchmen, Germans who controlled the forts to the north of Paris looking on, the second siege of the unhappy city within a year. Thus civil war succeeded for-

The second siege of Paris.

[1] Anderson, Constitutions and Documents, No. 126.

eign war, surpassing it in bitterness and ferocity. It lasted nearly two months, from April 2d to May 21st, when the Versailles troops forced their entrance into the city. Then followed seven days' ferocious fighting in the streets of Paris, the Communists more and more desperate and frenzied, the Versailles army more and more revengeful and sanguinary. This was the "bloody week," during which Paris suffered much more than she had from the bombardment of the Germans—a week of fearful destruction of life and property. The horrors of incendiarism were added to those of slaughter. "Everything," says Hanotaux, of May 23d, "was burning; there were explosions everywhere. A night of terror. The Porte Saint-Martin, the church of Saint-Eustache, the Rue Royale, the Rue de Rivoli, the Tuileries, the Palais-Royal, the Hôtel de Ville, the left bank from the Légion d'Honneur to the Palais de Justice, and the Police Office were immense red braziers, and above all rose lofty blazing columns. From outside, all the forts were firing upon Paris. . . . The gunners were cannonading one another across the town, and above the town. Shells fell in every direction. All the central quarters were a battle-field. It was a horrible chaos: bodies and souls in collision over a crumbling world."[1] The Communists shot their hostages. Finally the agony was brought to a close. On May 28th the last insurgents were shot down in the cemetery of Père-Lachaise.

The "bloody week."

The revenge taken by the Government possessed no quality of mercy. Racked by the horror of the week, infuriated by the belief that the Communists, seeing their defeat approaching, had made a deliberate attempt to destroy the city, horror-stricken at the murder of the hostages, of whom one was the Archbishop of Paris, it punished right and left summarily. Many were shot on the spot. "The number of men," says Hanotaux, "who perished in this horrible fray, without any other form of law, is estimated at 17,000. The cemeteries,

The Government's revenge.

[1] Hanotaux, Contemporary France. I, 215.

the squares, private or public gardens, saw trenches opened in which nameless corpses were deposited without register and without list, by thousands." [1] Arrests and trials went on for years. Up to 1875 over 43,000 had been arrested, over 350,000 denounced. The prisoners were judged by courts-martial. Nearly ten thousand were condemned summarily to various punishments, thousands being deported to New Caledonia. It was not until 1879 that an amnesty was passed for the remaining prisoners, and then only owing to the impassioned plea of Gambetta for pity. The result of all this was the deep embitterment of classes against each other. The revolutionary party, crushed and silenced, nourished its hatred of the bourgeoisie, who returned its hatred.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THIERS

France at peace.

Having put down the insurrection of Paris and signed the hard treaty with Germany, France was at peace. She had between July 1870 and June 1871 received such staggering blows that she had sunk rapidly from the position of the first power on the Continent to the rank of fourth or fifth. Immense destruction of national wealth and national prestige had characterized the Terrible Year. Time was needed for reorganization. France, overwhelmingly crushed, must be built up anew. This work of reconstruction was immediately undertaken by the Government of Thiers. That Government lasted over two years, and its achievements were notable. Thiers had been chosen by the Assembly of Bordeaux "chief of the executive." The Assembly was the only authority in France for several years. It had been elected February 8, 1871, but no definite powers had been vested in it, nor had the length of its term been fixed. Would this Assembly, which had been elected to decide the question of peace and war, consider itself competent to sit longer, to determine the future government of France, and if so, to decide that the government

The government of Thiers.

[1] Hanotaux, Ibid., 225.

should be a Monarchy, and not the Republic proclaimed by the crowd of Paris on September 4th? These were vital questions, which were, however, but slowly answered. The Assembly remained in power for nearly five years, from February 1871 to December 31, 1875, refusing to dissolve.

The Rivet law.

On August 31, 1871, it passed the important Rivet law, by which it accepted provisionally the existing government, declared that the chief of the executive should take the title of *President of the French Republic*, and that he should be responsible to the Assembly. The law also proclaimed that the Assembly possessed constituent powers, and was under the obligation to exercise them at the proper time. No definite term was established for the presidency. It was to last, so the Rivet law itself stated, as long as the Assembly lasted. The government, therefore, was one strictly by parliament. All sovereignty was declared vested in the Assembly. Thiers was really simply leader of the majority. As soon as he lost his majority he stepped down and out (1873).

But before that time came he accomplished an extraordinary work. Urging the parties to drop their merely partisan interests for the time being, he appealed to their patriotism, which was not lacking. France must be reorganized, the wounds of the past year healed. After that, let the question of the final form of government be brought forward.

The cost of the "Terrible Year."

The financial burdens created by the war, the Commune, and the loss of Alsace-Lorraine, were found, on examination, to amount to over fifteen billion francs, or about three billion dollars. The loss in life was great. It is estimated that about 140,000 men were killed, and more than that number wounded; that about 340,000 entered hospitals for various diseases. France lost about 1,600,000 inhabitants by the cession of Alsace-Lorraine, and apart from that, her population suffered a loss of about a half a million.

The most imperative task confronting the Government

was to get the Germans out of the country. By the Treaty of Frankfort France was to pay within three years a war indemnity of five billion francs. Until this was accomplished there was to be a German army of occupation in France, supported by France, and occupying a certain number of departments. This army was to be withdrawn gradually, as the instalments of the indemnity were paid. The army at first numbered about 500,000 men and 150,000 horses. The cost of their support was heavy.

The liberation of the territory.

Thiers wished to bring about evacuation with the utmost possible speed, in order to remove the humiliation of a victorious foreign soldiery in France, the possibility that their presence might at any moment provoke some incident which would lead to a new war, and also to save millions. Under his leadership the task of paying the Germans was undertaken with energy and carried out with celerity. The first five hundred million francs were paid in July 1871, and the German troops were withdrawn from Normandy. By the end of September 1871 1,500,000,000 had been paid, and troops had been withdrawn from all but twelve departments. By the end of 1871 the army of occupation numbered 150,000 men and 18,000 horses. Payments proceeded rapidly. In September 1873 the final instalment was met, and the last German soldiers left France. Thus French soil was freed nearly six months earlier than was provided by the treaty. This rapid liquidation of the indemnity had been effected by two successful loans contracted by the Government, one in 1871 for over 2,000,000,000 francs, the other in 1872 for nearly 3,500,000,000 francs. The former was oversubscribed two and a half times; the latter over fourteen times. This amazing success bore striking evidence to the wealth of the country. For his great services in this initial work of the reconstruction of France the National Assembly voted that Thiers had "deserved well of the country." That the country shared the sentiment was shown by its spontaneous bestowal of the grateful name, "The Liberator of the Territory."

The two years of Thiers' presidency were notable for the energy and success of the work of rebuilding France. Two measures in particular merit description, the local government bill, and the bill whereby the army was reconstructed and put on a far larger and sounder basis than ever before.

Reform in local government.

Local government was partially reorganized in the direction of decentralization. Some of the powers hitherto belonging to the central government were now vested in the departmental and communal councils. Hitherto the prefect, head of the department, and appointed by the central government, had had almost unlimited powers throughout his department. Ever since the Revolution various attempts had been made to reduce this excessive concentration of power in the hands of the officials in Paris. The outbreak of the Commune had made this question acute. A law was passed in 1871 permitting all adult men of a year's residence in the commune to elect the communal council, and in the smaller communes permitting the council to choose the mayor. In all towns of over 20,000 inhabitants, and in the chief towns of departments or *arrondissements*, the mayors were still to be appointed by the central government. The measure was a compromise between Napoleonic centralization and the complete self-government demanded by radical reformers. In only 460 communes would the mayors henceforth be appointed from Paris.

Army reform.

The reconstruction of the army was also urgent. A law was passed in July 1872 which, in its essential features, still remains the basis of the military system of France. The example of Prussia, so successful, was followed. Henceforth there was to be universal compulsory military service. The National Guard was abolished. The new army, based on universal obligatory service, was to be divided into four parts, with various terms: five years in the active army, and different periods in the various reserves. Certain special classes were to be required to give only one year's service,

as for instance, young men who showed certain certificates of advanced education. These must, however, pay to the state the amount of 1500 francs. Other classes were exempted entirely from service—ecclesiastics, teachers, and sons of widows, supposed to be supporters of families. The enactment of this law, with the principle of compulsory service for five years in the active army, was one of the most important acts of the early years of the Third Republic. In the face of the threats from Germany, alarmed at this revival of French military power, France went steadily ahead with her projects of reorganization. Not only was a new and large army provided, but fortresses were built, equipment created, all burdensome, yet willingly borne.

The question of the permanent form of government.

In regard to the subjects which grew out of the war, the terms of peace, and the necessary measures of reconstruction, the Assembly was able to work on the whole harmoniously. But now a question, which could no longer be postponed, and which was highly divisive in its nature, entered upon its acute phase—the question of the permanent form of government. The Republic existed *de facto*, but not in law. It had been merely proclaimed by an insurrectionary body in Paris in September 1870. The Assembly, which was elected in the following February, and which represented all France, proved to be composed, as we have seen, in the majority, of Monarchists. Would these Monarchists consider that they were elected to make a constitution, not simply to determine the question of peace and war? If so, would they not simply declare the restoration of the Monarchy? They did not at first attempt this, probably because they preferred that the odium of a peace relinquishing French territory should attach to the Republic, not to the restored Monarchy. But now that the peace was made, the territory freed, the necessary laws passed, the Monarchists became active. They found they had in Thiers a man who would not abet them in their project. Thiers

Thiers and the Republic.

was originally a believer in constitutional monarchy, but he was not afraid of a republican government, and during the years after 1870 he came to believe that a Republic was, for France, at the close of a turbulent century, the only possible form of government. "There is," he said, "only one throne, and there are three claimants for a seat on it." He discovered a happy formula in favor of the Republic, "It is the form of government which divides us least." And again, "Those parties who want a monarchy, do not want the same monarchy." By which phrases he accurately described a curious situation. The Monarchists, while they constituted a majority of the Assembly, were divided into three parties, no one of which was in the majority. There were Legitimists, Orleanists, and Bonapartists. The Legitimists upheld the right of the grandson of Charles X, the Count of Chambord; the Orleanists, the right of the grandson of Louis Philippe, the Count of Paris; the Bonapartists, of Napoleon III, or his son. The Monarchist parties could unite to prevent a definite, explicit establishment of the Republic; they could not unite to establish the monarchy, as each wing wished a different monarch. Out of this division arose the only chance the Third Republic had to live. As the months went by, the Monarchists felt that Thiers was becoming constantly more of a Republican, which was true; not a Republican of affection, but one of reason. He was, therefore, too dangerous a man to leave in power, as he might, so great was the authority of his name and argument, persuade the former Monarchists to become Republicans. Indeed, it has been estimated that probably about a hundred members of the Assembly were influenced by him in that direction. If a monarchical restoration was to be attempted, therefore, Thiers must be gotten out of the way. But he had thus far been indispensable. Now, however, that peace was made, the finances regulated, the army reorganized, he was considered no longer necessary, and in 1873 was outvoted in

The Monarchist parties.

Resignation of Thiers.

the Assembly, and resigned, and Marshal MacMahon was chosen president to prepare the way for the coming monarch.

THE FRAMING OF THE CONSTITUTION

The Count of Chambord.

Earnest attempts were made forthwith to bring about a restoration of the monarchy. This could be done by a fusion of the Legitimists and the Orleanists. Circumstances were particularly favorable for the accomplishment of such a union. The Count of Chambord had no direct descendants. The inheritance would, therefore, upon his death, pass to the House of Orleans, represented by the Count of Paris. The elder branch would in the course of nature be succeeded by the younger. This fusion seemed accomplished when the Count of Paris visited the Count of Chambord, recognizing him as head of the family. A committee of nine members of the Assembly, representing the Monarchist parties, the Imperialists holding aloof, negotiated during the summer of 1873 with the "King" concerning the terms of restoration. The negotiations were successful on most points, and it seemed as if by the close of the year the existence of the Republic would be terminated and Henry V would be reigning in France. The Republic was saved by the devotion of the Count of Chambord to a symbol. He stated that he would never renounce the ancient Bourbon banner. "Henry V could never abandon the white flag of Henry IV," he had already declared, and from that resolution he never swerved. The tricolor represented the Revolution. If he was to be King of France it must be with his principles and his flag; King of the Revolution he would never consent to be. The Orleanists, on the other hand, adhered to the tricolor, knowing its popularity with the people, knowing that no régime that repudiated the glorious symbol could long endure. Against this barrier the attempted fusion of the two branches of the Bourbon family was shattered. The immediate danger to the Republic was over.

But the Monarchists did not renounce their hope of re-

storing the monarchy. The Count of Chambord might, perhaps, change his mind: if not, as he had no son, the Count of Paris would succeed him after his death as the lawful claimant to the throne; and the Count of Paris, defender of the tricolor, could then be proclaimed. The Monarchists, therefore, planned merely to gain time. Marshal MacMahon had been chosen executive, as had Thiers, for no definite term. He was to serve during the pleasure of the Assembly itself. Believing that MacMahon would resign as soon as the King really appeared, they voted that his term should be for seven years, expecting that a period of that length would see a clearing up of the situation, either the change of mind or the death of the Count of Chambord. Thus was established the Septennate, or seven year term, of the president, which still exists. The presidency was thus given a fixed term by the Monarchists, as they supposed, in their own interests. If they could not restore the monarchy in 1873, they could at least control the presidency for a considerable period, and thus prepare an easy transition to the new system at the opportune moment.

Establishment of the Septennate.

But France showed unmistakably that she desired the establishment of a definitive system, that she wished to be through with these provisional arrangements, which only kept party feeling feverish and handicapped France in her foreign relations. France had as yet no constitution, and yet this Assembly, chosen to make peace, had asserted that it was also chosen to frame a constitution, and it was by this assertion that it justified its continuance in power long after peace was made. Yet month after month, and year after year, went by and the constitution was not made, nor even seriously discussed. If the Assembly could not, or would not, make a constitution, it should relinquish its power and let the people elect a body that would. But this it steadily refused to do.

Assembly reluctant to frame a constitution.

There was a dispute even as to what the form of government was at that moment. Was it a Republic or not? It

is true that the Assembly had elected a *President of the Republic*. It had thus inferentially ratified the proclamation of the Parisians of September 4, 1870. But was this merely provisional? The Republic needed to be founded on fundamental laws before it could really be considered established.

The Assembly active against Republicans.

But not only would the Assembly not frankly proclaim the Republic, even after the attempt to restore "Henry V" had failed, but, on the other hand, it endeavored to stamp out the Republican propaganda, which was steadily gaining ground among the people under the inspiring leadership of Gambetta. In order to increase its power in this contest with the Republicans, the Assembly altered the local government laws described above. By the law of 1873 the mayors of all the communes in France were to be appointed directly or indirectly by the ministry, and not elected by the local council, as by the law of 1871. This gave the ministry control of a number of office-holders in each town, who must do its bidding. Busts representing the Republic were removed from all public buildings; the name Republic was ostentatiously omitted from public documents. Republican newspapers were prosecuted and harassed in many ways. In a year more than 200 of them were arbitrarily suppressed. Such conduct rendered the Republicans more united and resolute. Gambetta journeyed from town to town, winning over to the Republic by his remarkable eloquence and powers of argumentation "new social classes," now influential by reason of universal suffrage, the lower ranks of the bourgeoisie, and the working class. The party grew steadily.

Growth of the Republican party.

Every day, therefore, the Assembly could less safely appeal to the people by a dissolution, yet with the rising tide of disaffection it must appeal to it or must set about giving the country permanent institutions, as a method of restoring quiet. Just at this time, when feeling ran so high, the Bonapartist party became aggressive, and won a number of successes at elections. The danger of a Bonapartist revival was one of the causes which prompted the Assembly

finally to take up seriously the consideration of the constitution. Would not the people rush to the support of the Bonapartists when they saw that the Assembly could not establish the Monarchy, and would not establish the Republic? A number of Orleanist members preferred even a republic to another Napoleonic empire, and it was through their secession that the majority shifted in the Assembly to the Republicans. Only, they insisted on making the Republic as *conservative* as possible, with as many of the attributes of monarchy as could be thrown about it. As the Republicans needed the votes of these Orleanists in order to carry through their plans at all, they were forced to make liberal concessions in this direction.

The Constitution of 1875.

Out of this confused and abnormal situation arose the laws known as the Constitution of 1875; a law on the Organization of the Senate (February 24); on the Organization of the Public Powers (February 25); and on the Relations of the Public Powers (July 16); and other organic laws passed later. At the beginning of the discussion it was found that the word "republic" was avoided in the texts. Proposed in the form of an amendment, it was voted down. Only later, and by indirection, was it adopted in speaking of the mode of election of "the President of the Republic." Even this phrase, the famous Wallon amendment, was adopted by a majority of only one vote, 353 to 352. Throughout the constitution it is only in connection with the presidential title that the word occurs. There is no formal but only this implicit statement that France is a republic. The difficult word was officially uttered by an Assembly that would have established monarchy if it could have.[1]

The Senate.

By the laws of 1875 a legislature consisting of two houses was established, a Senate and a Chamber of Deputies. The Senate was to consist of 300 members, at least forty years of age. The Monarchists wished to have the members

[1] A constitutional amendment adopted in 1884 renders the matter explicit: "The republican form of government shall not be made the subject of a proposed revision."

appointed by the President. It was finally determined, however, that one-fourth, or 75, should be elected for life by the Assembly itself, the remainder for a term of nine years. The Republicans wished to have these senators chosen by direct universal suffrage, but the Assembly wished to limit the sphere of universal suffrage as much as possible. It was finally decided that the senators of each department should be chosen by an electoral college. This electoral college should consist of various classes, the deputies from that department, members of the general department council, members of the arrondissement or district councils, and, more important than all the others because more numerous, of one delegate from each commune of the department, chosen by the communal council. The Monarchists insisted on this arrangement as likely to give them control of the Senate. No distinction was made between communes. A large city and a small country village were each to send one delegate to the college which should choose the senator. As the representatives from the country communes or villages were the more numerous class, and as the Monarchists, being large landed proprietors, had great influence in the rural districts, it was likely that the Senate could thus be controlled by them. One-third of the Senate was to be renewed every three years.

There was also to be a Chamber of Deputies, elected by universal suffrage for a four-year term. The Senate and Chamber of Deputies, meeting together, should constitute a National Assembly. Organized in this form they should have the power to elect the President and to revise the Constitution. The President is chosen for seven years, and may be re-elected. There is no vice-president, no succession provided by law. In case of a vacancy in the presidency the National Assembly meets and elects a new President, generally within forty-eight hours. The President has the right to initiate legislation, as have the members of the two chambers, the duty to promulgate laws after their passage, to superintend their execution, the pardoning power, the direc-

The President.

tion of the army and navy, and the appointment to all civil and military positions. He may, with the consent of the Senate, dissolve the Chamber of Deputies before the expiration of its legal term and order a new election. But these powers are merely nominal, for the reason that every act of the President must be countersigned by a minister, who thereby becomes responsible for the act, the President being irresponsible, except in the case of high treason.[1]

The most fundamental feature of the French Republic, as established by the laws of 1875, is the parliamentary system, as worked out in England. "The ministers are jointly and severally responsible to the Chambers for the general policy of the government, and individually for their personal acts," says the law. The ministry, therefore, is the real executive, and it is practically a committee of the Chambers, chosen to exercise the executive power under the nominal direction of the President. The ministry must resign as soon as it loses support of the Chambers. The Chambers, therefore, possess control of the executive, as of the legislative power. These powers, instead of being carefully separated, as in our constitution, are really fused, as in the English system. Parliament is the center and head of power. The President's position resembles that of the constitutional monarch; one of ceremonial representation of the state, without real power, other than that which may flow from his personality, his powers of suggestion or advice, which the ministers may listen to or not. The ministers are responsible to parliament, that is, practically to the Chamber of Deputies, as the popular chamber. It is the Chamber that really makes and unmakes ministries by its votes, that is, controls the executive branch of the government. The Chamber has proved able even to force the President to resign before the expiration of his seven-

The ministry.

[1] These laws are given in Anderson, Constitutions and Documents, No. 133; also in Dodd, Modern Constitutions, I, 286-294; in French in Lowell, Governments and Parties, II, 337-344.

year term by refusing to support any ministry, thus bringing all state action to a standstill. France has a constitution more democratic than that of England or the United States, in both of which countries the popularly elected chamber encounters serious checks.

France a parliamentary republic.

Not that this was apparent to the Assembly that created this system. Not for some years was it clear that the democratic element of this constitution was to be the vital part. The monarchical assembly that established the parliamentary republic in 1875 thought that it had introduced sufficient monarchical elements into it to curb the aggressiveness of democracy and to facilitate a restoration of the Monarchy at some convenient season. By reducing the presidency to a nominal position it aimed to prevent one-man power, the emergence of a Bonaparte, as in 1848 and 1851. The Senate, it thought, would be a monarchical stronghold. And the President and Senate could probably keep the Chamber of Deputies in check by their power of dissolving it. The Republicans accepted this system as better than monarchy or the existing provisional scheme. It bore the name Republic, and they hoped to make it a Republic in more than name. Some Radical Republicans, however, denounced the Constitution as a mockery.

The Constitution of 1875 was plainly a compromise between opposing forces, neither of which could win an unalloyed victory. It was as Hanotaux says, "a dose prepared for a convalescent country."

Dissolution of the National Assembly.

Having completed the Constitutional Laws, the National Assembly which had been in session since February 1871, which had ratified the Treaty of Frankfort, had liberated the territory, and had reorganized the army and local government, dissolved itself December 31, 1875. The elections to the Senate and Chamber of Deputies were held at the beginning of 1876. The Monarchists secured a slight majority in the former, the Republicans a large majority in the latter. MacMahon at first appointed a ministry of Repub-

licans, insisting, however, that three departments were outside politics, therefore not controllable by Parliament—the departments of War, Navy, and Foreign Affairs.

The Republic and the Church.

The Monarchists now began a vigorous agitation against the Republicans. They were powerfully supported by the clerical party, which, ever since 1871, had been extremely active. The Republicans resented this intrusion of the Catholic party into politics, and their opinion was vividly expressed by Gambetta, who in the Chamber threw out a phrase which became famous—"Clericalism—that is our enemy,"—meaning that the Roman Catholic Church was the most dangerous opponent of the Republic. These Anti-Republican groups persuaded President MacMahon that he was not bound to accept a ministry at the bidding of the Chambers, that he had the right to a personal policy, a programme of his own. As certain elections of the bodies which participated in the choice of senators were to be held toward the close of 1877, and as they would probably result in the Republicans capturing the Senate, if conducted by a Republican ministry, and as he believed that the triumph of the Republicans would be harmful to France, to the army, to foreign prestige, MacMahon virtually dismissed, May 16, 1877, the Simon ministry, which had the support of the Chamber, and appointed a ministry, composed largely of Monarchists, under the Duke de Broglie. Thereupon, the Senate, representing the same views, consented to the dissolution of the Chamber, and new elections were prepared.

MacMahon's conception of the presidency.

Thus a constitutional question was created—the relation of the Presidency to the Chamber of Deputies. If the President was to resemble the British sovereign, he had no right to a personal policy of his own, no right to dismiss ministers acceptable to Parliament. MacMahon's opinion was that he had that right, and that "if the Chamber did not approve, it remained for the people to decide between him and it" by a dissolution and new elections.

This was a contest for political power between the President and the Senate on the one hand, the Chamber on the other. As the Constitution gave the President and Senate the right to dissolve the Chamber, they had the upper hand, at least until the people voted. A crisis had arisen which involved an interpretation of the Constitution. The President did not consider himself a mere figurehead, did not propose to consider the Chamber of Deputies as supreme.

This question was now fought out before the people. A new Chamber of Deputies was to be chosen. The Broglie ministry used every effort to influence the voters against Gambetta and the Republicans. Republican office-holders were removed and reactionaries put in their place. The political machinery was used to hamper the Republicans, to silence or curb the Republican newspapers. Gambetta coined another famous phrase, when he declared that after the people should have spoken, MacMahon must "either submit or resign." For this he was prosecuted, and condemned to three months of prison and a fine of 2,000 francs. Official candidates were put forth for the Chamber, supported by the ministry and office-holders. The clergy took an active part in the campaign, supporting the official candidates, and preaching against the Republicans, conduct which in the end was to cost them dear. The struggle was embittered. It was a contest between the monarchical and republican principles, with the clergy, then very influential, in favor of the former. The bishops ordered a supplication for a favorable vote. The supplication was apparently not heard. The Republicans were overwhelmingly victorious. In the new Chamber they had a majority of over a hundred. MacMahon "submitted," and took a Republican ministry.

Victory of the Republicans.

In the next year, 1878, an election of one-third of the Senate occurred. The Republicans now gained control of that body. With both Chambers Republican, Marshal MacMahon's position became very difficult. The Chambers demanded the retirement from the army of certain generals,

who were opposed to the Republicans. MacMahon refused to remove them on the ground that this would be prejudicial to the army, which should be kept out of politics. Rather than acquiesce he resigned the Presidency, January 30, 1879. The National Assembly immediately met and elected Jules Grévy president, a man whose devotion to Republican principles had been known to France for thirty years. For the first time since 1871 the Republicans controlled the Chamber of Deputies, the Senate, and the Presidency. Since that time the Republic has been entirely in the hands of the Republicans.

Resignation of MacMahon.

REPUBLICAN LEGISLATION

Jules Grévy had in 1848 advocated the suppression of the Presidency on the ground that one-man power was dangerous. He now administered the office in a manner sharply contrasting with that of MacMahon. He had no personal policy, he never personally intervened in the conduct of affairs; that was the province of the ministry. His example has been followed by succeeding presidents. Thus the Presidency has lost any suggestion of monarchy it may ever have had. In the war of politics the President is a neutral figure, affiliating with no party.

Grévy chosen President.

The Republicans, now completely victorious, and no longer merely on the defensive, shortly broke up into numerous groups. Ministries changed with great frequency, and it is not in the permutations and combinations of politicians that the main significance of the next period lies, but in the constructive work which aimed to consolidate the Republic. Two personalities stand out with particular prominence: Gambetta, as president of the Chamber of Deputies, and Jules Ferry, as member of several ministries and as twice prime minister. The legislation enacted during this period aimed to clinch the victory over the Monarchists and Clericals by making the institutions of France thoroughly republican and secular. The seat of government was trans-

Republican legislation.

ferred from Versailles, where it had been since 1871, to Paris (1880), and July 14th, the day of the storming of the Bastille, symbol of the triumph of the people over the monarchy, was declared the national holiday, and was celebrated for the first time in 1880 amid great enthusiasm. The right of citizens freely to hold public meetings as they might wish, and without any preliminary permission of the Government, was secured, as was also a practically unlimited freedom of the press (1881). Municipal councils were once more given the right to elect mayors (1882), and their administrative power was greatly augmented (1884). This was an enlargement of the sphere of local self-government, a great school of political training for the people. Workingmen were permitted, for the first time, freely to form trades unions (1884). Divorce, which Napoleon had introduced into the Code, but which was abolished in 1814, was restored in 1884.

Creation of a national system of education.

The Republicans were particularly solicitous about education. As universal suffrage was the basis of the state, it was considered fundamental that the voters should be intelligent. Education was regarded as the strongest bulwark of the Republic. Several laws were passed, concerning all grades of education, but the most important were those concerning primary schools. A law of 1881 made primary education gratuitous; one of 1882 made it compulsory bebetween the ages of six and thirteen, and later laws made it entirely secular. No religious instruction is given in these schools. All teachers are appointed from the laity. This system of popular education is one of the great creative achievements of the Republic, and one of the most fruitful. It has increased the number of those in primary schools by 850,000. Illiteracy has dropped from 25 per cent. to 4 per cent. for the men, and from 38 per cent. to 7 per cent. for the women. To carry out this system immense expenditures have been necessary, to erect schoolhouses and to employ more teachers. Twenty-five thousand schoolhouses have

been built, or rebuilt, at an expense of over 140 million dollars, and the appropriations for the maintenance, which falls upon the state, for primary education is an affair of the nation, not of the locality, has trebled. This legislation was enacted under the vigorous direction and inspiration of the Minister of Public Instruction, Jules Ferry, and is one of his most enduring titles to fame. Laws were also passed concerning secondary, university, and technical education. The Government undertook in this legislation to free the schools from all clerical control, on the ground that the clergy were enemies of the Republic. Further evidences of this anti-clerical feeling are found in the expulsion of the Jesuits from France in 1880, and in the refusal to all unauthorized religious orders of the right to maintain schools. Schools might, however, be maintained by the secular clergy and by those orders which should receive the sanction of the Government.

Public Works.

The Republic also entered upon a policy of large expenditures for public works, such as the building of railways, canals, the dredging of harbors and rivers, the erection and equipment of fortresses along the Belgian and German frontiers.

Revision of the Constitution.

In 1884 the Constitution was revised in that the principle of life membership in the Senate was abolished. There were 75 such seats. It was provided that, as these seats became vacant, they should be filled by the election of ordinary senators, for the regular term of nine years.

Colonial policy.

Under the masterful influence of Jules Ferry, prime minister in 1881, and again from 1883 to 1885, the Republic embarked upon an aggressive foreign policy. She established a protectorate over Tunis; sent an expedition to Tonkin, to Madagascar; founded the French Congo. This policy aroused bitter opposition from the beginning, and entailed large expenditures, but Ferry, regardless of growing opposition, forced it through, in the end to his own undoing. His motives in throwing France into these ven-

tures were various. One reason was economic. France was feeling the rivalry of Germany and Italy, and Ferry believed that she must gain new markets as compensation for those she was gradually losing. Again, France would gain in prestige abroad, and in her own feeling of contentment, if she turned her attention to empire-building and ceased to think morbidly of her losses in the German war. Her outlook would be broader. Moreover, she could not afford to be passive when other nations about her were reaching out for Africa and Asia. The era of imperialism had begun. France must participate in the movement or be left hopelessly behind in the rivalry of nations. Under Ferry's resolute leadership the policy of expansion was carried out, and the colonial possessions of France were greatly increased, but at the expense of political peace at home.

THE RISE OF BOULANGISM

Increase of the national debt.

Policies so decided, so far-reaching, so ambitious had many enemies—Clericals, Monarchists. Such sweeping undertakings as educational reform and empire-building were very expensive. The Government gave up all idea of economy, and was forced to negotiate new loans, thereby greatly increasing the national debt, and to levy new taxes. Moreover, there was a vigorous group of Republicans, the Radicals, whose leader was Clémenceau, who denounced these colonial enterprises as involving war, which they hated, as being an attack upon other peoples who had a right to be free, as expensive and therefore an unjustifiable luxury for a country that had been through the experience of France, and as tending to divert attention from domestic problems, whose solution they felt to be urgent. These Radical Republicans demanded the separation of Church and State, the reduction of the powers of the Senate, an income tax that wealth might bear its proper proportion of the burdens of the state. The rivalry of the Republican factions now lost all bounds, and when a false rumor reached Paris of a

failure of the war in Tonkin, these Radicals joined with the Monarchists and Clericals in May 1885 to overthrow Ferry, one of the strong figures of the Republic's history. Though he had vastly augmented the empire, public opinion had been so vehemently aroused by the campaign of attack and slander against him that he had become extremely unpopular.

During the next three years, from 1886 to 1889, the political situation was troubled, uncertain, factious, nervous. There was no commanding personality in politics to give elevation and sweep to men's ideas. Gambetta had died in 1882 at the age of forty-four, and Ferry was most unjustly the victim of obloquy, from which he never recovered. Ministries succeeded each other with meaningless rapidity. Politics appeared to be merely a petty game of getting offices, not of pursuing matured policies of state. There was a great deal of discontent with the Republic. Many had been embittered by the policy of secularizing education; many by the colonial ventures. The Republic was a parliamentary republic, and parliamentary institutions were in the opinion of many utterly discredited. The incessant changes of ministries, the petty and bitter personalities of political life, the absence of conspicuous leaders with large ideas, rendered France disillusioned and bored. The Republic was spending more than its income on the various undertakings described above, and deficits were the result, alarming the public mind. Just at this time, too, a scandal was unearthed in President Grévy's own household. His son-in-law, Wilson, was found to be using his influence for purposes of trafficking in the bestowal of places in the Legion of Honor, and as a result, the President, in no sense involved, yet defending his son-in-law, was forced to resign, and was succeeded by Carnot, a moderate Republican (December 3, 1887). Moreover, many believed that as no régime in France for a century had outlasted eighteen years, the Republic would form no exception, and the eighteen years were nearly up.

Death of Gambetta.

Discontent with the Republic.

Such a state of discontent and despondency, justified in part, in part fictitious, created a real crisis for the Republic, in which its very life was at stake. If the Parliamentary Republic was unable to give a strong and intelligent government, might not France welcome a dictator, as she had done in the case of two previous republics? A person was at hand anxious to serve in this capacity,

Boulanger.

General Boulanger. A dashing figure on horseback, an attractive speaker, General Boulanger sought to use the popular discontent for his own advancement. Made Minister of War in 1886, he showed much activity, seeking the favor of the soldiers by improving the conditions of life in the barracks, and by advocating the reduction of the required term of service. He controlled several newspapers, which began to insinuate that under his leadership France could take her revenge upon Germany by a successful war upon that country. The scandal of the Legion of Honor decorations occurring opportunely, and involving the resignation of the President, encouraged his campaign. He posed as the rescuer of the Republic, demanding a total revision of the Constitution. His programme, as announced, was vague, but probably aimed at the diminution of the importance of Parliament, and the conferring of great powers upon the President, and his election directly by the people, which he hoped would be favorable to himself. For three years his personality was a storm center. Discontented people of the most varied shades flocked to his support—Monarchists, Imperialists, Clericals, hoping to use him to overturn the Republic. These parties contributed money to the support of his campaign, which was brilliantly managed, with the view to focusing popular attention upon him. To show the popular enthusiasm Boulanger now became a candidate for Parliament in many districts where vacancies occurred. In five months (1888) he was elected deputy six times. A seventh election in Paris itself, in January 1889, resulted in a brilliant triumph. He was elected by over 80,000 majority.

Would he dare take the final step and attempt to seize power, as two Bonapartes had done before him? He did not have the requisite audacity to try. In the face of this imminent danger the Republicans ceased their dissensions and stood together. They assumed the offensive. The ministry summoned Boulanger to appear before the Senate, sitting as a High Court of Justice, to meet the charge of conspiring against the safety of the state. His boldness vanished. He fled from the country to Belgium. He was condemned by the Court in his absence. His party fell to pieces, its leader proving so little valorous. Two years later he committed suicide. The Republic had weathered a serious crisis. In the elections to the Chamber of Deputies of 1889 the Republicans defeated badly all opponents—Monarchists, Imperialists, Boulangists—gaining a majority of nearly a hundred and fifty. It was clear that the Republic was becoming year by year more solidly established in the devotion of the voters. This was shown again still more strongly four years later, in the elections of 1893.

The Republic weathers the crisis.

The utter collapse of Boulanger had several important consequences. It strengthened the Republic, proved its vitality, and discredited its opponents. It also discredited the idea of a revision of the Constitution. From now on conditions began to improve. The Exposition of 1889 in Paris was a great success, proved to all the world the remarkable recuperation of France, and was a reminder of the Revolution of 1789, from which the country had gained so much. Convinced that the Republic was to be permanent and not a transitory phenomenon, Pope Leo XIII ordered the bishops to cease their attacks upon it, and in Parliament a certain number of Catholic politicians rallied to it. In 1891 an alliance was made with Russia, which ended the long period of diplomatic isolation, served as a counterweight to the Triple Alliance of Germany, Austria, and Italy, and satisfied the French people, as well as increased their sense of safety and their confidence in the

The Dual Alliance.

future. In 1892 France entered upon a policy of high tariffs for purposes of protection.

The Republicans were henceforth in an overwhelming majority, but divided into various groups. The Radicals were more numerous than before, and a new party appeared, the Socialists, with some sixty members. As the Republic was becoming more solidly established, it was also becoming more radical. The history of the next fifteen years was to be the proof of this.

In 1894 President Carnot was assassinated. Casimir-Périer was chosen to succeed him, but resigned after six months. Félix Faure, a moderate Republican, was chosen to succeed him. Under Faure the alliance with Russia was still further strengthened and proclaimed. This is the most important fact in the recent diplomatic history of France, tending to raise her international position, and to make her more contented by gratifying her self-esteem, and by increasing her sense of security.

Faure died in office in 1899. Under his presidency (1895-1899) the most burning question of internal politics was the Dreyfus case, for many years a dominant issue, creating another serious crisis for the Republic. An examination of that case is essential to an understanding of recent French history.

THE DREYFUS CASE

The Dreyfus case.

In October 1894, Alfred Dreyfus, an Alsatian Jew, and a captain in the artillery, attached to the General Staff, was arrested amid circumstances of unusual secrecy, was treated with great harshness, and was brought before a court-martial, where he was accused of treason, of transmitting important military documents to a foreign power, presumably Germany. The accusation rested on a document that had come into the possession of the War Office, and was soon to be famous as the "bordereau," a memorandum merely containing a list of several documents said to be

inclosed. The bordereau bore no address, no date, nor signature, but it was declared to be in the known handwriting of Dreyfus. The court-martial, acting behind closed doors, found him guilty, and condemned him to expulsion from the army and to imprisonment for life. In January 1895 he was publicly degraded in a most dramatic manner in the courtyard of the Military School, before a large detachment of the army. His stripes were torn from his uniform, his sword was broken. Throughout this agonizing scene he was defiant, asserted his innocence, and shouted "*Vive la France!*" He was then deported to a small, barren, and unhealthy island off French Guiana, in South America, appropriately called Devil's Island, and was there kept in solitary confinement. A life imprisonment under such conditions would probably not be long, though it would certainly be horrible.

Dreyfus degraded and imprisoned.

No one questioned the justice of the verdict. The opinion was practically unanimous that he had received a traitor's deserts. Only the immediate family and circle of Dreyfus maintained that a monstrous wrong had been done, and demanded further investigation. Their protests passed unheeded. The case was considered closed.

Picquart.

It was reopened in 1896 by Colonel Picquart, one of the youngest and most promising officers in the army, attached since June 1895 to the detective bureau, or Intelligence Department, of the General Staff. In the course of his duties he had become convinced that the "bordereau" was not the work of Dreyfus, but of a certain Major Esterhazy, who was shortly shown to be one of the most abandoned characters in the army. Picquart informed his superior, the Minister of War, of this discovery. The military authorities, instead of investigating the matter, not wishing to have the case reopened, sent Picquart to Tunis and Algeria, the purpose apparently being to get him out of the way. Colonel Henry was appointed to his place.

By this time the public was becoming interested. Some

of the documents in the famous case had found their way into print; the mysterious elements in the proceedings aroused curiosity and some uneasiness.

Toward the end of 1897, Scheurer-Kestner, a vice-president of the Senate, who had become convinced of the innocence of Dreyfus, tried to have the case reopened. His efforts met with the blunt statement of the prime minister, Méline, that the Dreyfus case no longer existed, was a *chose jugée*. But the fact that a man of such importance, and such known integrity of character and mind, as Scheurer-Kestner, was convinced that a cruel wrong had been committed, was of unmistakable consequence. The wrath of the anti-Dreyfus party was increased; criminations and recriminations flew back and forth. Race hatred of the Jews, zealously fanned for several years by a group of journalists, fed the flames.

Esterhazy was now brought before a court-martial, given a very travesty of a trial, and triumphantly acquitted, congratulated, *avec émotion*, by the members of the court itself (January 11, 1898). On the next day Colonel Picquart was arrested and imprisoned on charges made by Esterhazy.

Zola attempts to reopen the case.

On the day following that, January 13th, Émile Zola, the well-known novelist, published a letter of great boldness and brilliancy, in which he made most scathing charges against the judges of both the Dreyfus and Esterhazy courts-martial, and practically dared the Government to prosecute him. His desire was thus to reopen the whole Dreyfus question. The Government prosecuted him in a trial which was a parody of justice, secured his condemnation to imprisonment and fine, and evaded the question of Dreyfus. The Zola condemnation was later quashed by a higher court on a mere technicality. He was later tried again, and again condemned (July 1898) by default, having fled to London. The Dreyfus case had not been reopened.

Meanwhile, the Méline ministry had been overthrown, and the Brisson ministry had come into power, with Cavaignac

as Minister of War. On July 7, 1898, Cavaignac, intending to settle this troublesome matter once for all, made a speech before the Chamber of Deputies in which, omitting all mention of the bordereau, he brought forward three documents as new proofs of the guilt of Dreyfus. His speech was so convincing that the Chamber, by a vote of five hundred and seventy-two to two, ordered that it should be posted in every one of the thirty-six thousand communes of France. The victory was overwhelming.

Speech of Cavaignac, Minister of War.

Immediately, however, Colonel Picquart wrote to Cavaignac that he could prove that the first two documents cited had nothing to do with Dreyfus, and that the third was an outright forgery. He was rearrested. It was immediately after this that Zola was condemned for the second time, as stated above.

Events now took a most sensational turn. At the end of August the newspapers of Paris contained the announcement that Colonel Henry had confessed that he had forged the document which Picquart had declared was a forgery and that then he had committed suicide. Cavaignac resigned, maintaining, however, that the crime of Henry did not prove the innocence of Dreyfus.

The public was vastly disturbed by these events. Why was there any need of new proof to establish Dreyfus's guilt, and if the new proof was the work of crime, what about the original proof, the famous bordereau? At this juncture the case was referred to the Court of Cassation, the highest court in France. While it was deliberating, the President, Faure, known as an anti-Dreyfusite, died suddenly under somewhat mysterious circumstances, and on February 18, 1899, Émile Loubet, known to be favorable to a reopening of the question, was chosen as his successor.

Sensations showed no signs of abating. On June 2nd, Esterhazy, who had fled to England, announced that he had himself written the bordereau. The enemies of Dreyfus now asserted that he had simply been bribed by the Dreyfus

Court of Cassation orders a retrial of Dreyfus.

party to make this declaration. On the next day the Court of Cassation annulled the decision of the court-martial of 1894, and ordered that Dreyfus be tried again before a court-martial at Rennes. Dreyfus was brought from Devil's Island, and his second trial began in August 1899.

This new trial was conducted in the midst of the most excited state of the public mind in France, and of intense interest abroad. Party passions were inflamed as they had not been in France since the Commune. The supporters of Dreyfus were denounced frantically as slanderers of the honor of the army, the very bulwark of the safety of the country, as traitors to France.

At the Rennes tribunal, Dreyfus encountered the violent hostility of the high army officers, who had been his accusers five years before. These men were desperately resolved that he should again be found guilty. The trial was of an extraordinary character. It was the evident purpose of the judges not to allow the matter to be thoroughly probed. Testimony, which in England or America would have been considered absolutely vital, was barred out. The universal opinion outside France was, as was stated in the London *Times*, "that the whole case against Captain Dreyfus, as set forth by the heads of the French army, in plain combination against him, was foul with forgeries, lies, contradictions and puerilities, and that nothing to justify his condemnation had been shown."

Dreyfus again declared guilty.

Nevertheless, the court, by a vote of five to two, declared him guilty, "with extenuating circumstances," an amazing verdict. It is not generally held that treason to one's country can plead extenuating circumstances. The court condemned him to ten years' imprisonment, from which the years spent at Devil's Island might be deducted. Thus the "honor" of the army had been maintained.

Dreyfus pardoned.

President Loubet immediately pardoned Dreyfus, and he was released, broken in health. This solution was satisfactory to neither side. The anti-Dreyfusites vented their

rage on Loubet. On the other hand, Dreyfus demanded exoneration, a recognition of his innocence, not pardon.

But the Government was resolved that this discussion, which had so frightfully torn French society, should cease. Against the opposition of the Dreyfusites, it passed, in 1900, an amnesty for all those implicated in the notorious case, which meant that no legal actions could be brought against any of the participants on either side. The friends of Dreyfus, Zola, and Picquart protested vigorously against the erection of a barrier against their vindication. The bill, nevertheless, passed.

Six years later, however, the Dreyfus party attained its vindication. The revision of the whole case was submitted to the Court of Cassation. On July 12, 1906, that body quashed the verdict of the Rennes court-martial. It declared that the charges which had been brought against Dreyfus had no foundation, that the bordereau was the work of Esterhazy, that another document of importance was a forgery, that the Rennes court-martial had been guilty of gross injustice in refusing to hear testimony that would have established the innocence of the accused. The case was not to be submitted to another military tribunal but was closed. **Dreyfus vindicated.**

The Government now restored Captain Dreyfus to his rank in the army, or rather, gave him the rank of major, allowing him to count to that end the whole time in which he had been unjustly deprived of his standing. On July 21, 1906, he was invested with a decoration of the Legion of Honor in the very courtyard of the Military School, where eleven years before he had been so dramatically degraded. Colonel Picquart was promoted brigadier-general, and shortly became Minister of War. Zola had died in 1903, but in 1908 his body was transferred to the Pantheon, as symbolizing a kind of civic canonization. Thus ended the "Affair."

The Dreyfus case, originally simply involving the fate of an alleged traitor, had soon acquired a far greater sig-

Significance of the case.

nificance. Party and personal ambitions and interests sought to use it for purposes of their own, and thus the question of legal right and wrong was woefully distorted and obscured. The Anti-Semites used it to inflame the people against the Jews. They won the support of the Clericals, ingeniously suggesting that the so-called anti-religious legislation of the Third Republic, particularly that establishing secular education, was really the work of the Jews, influencing politicians by their money, and that the Jews were now getting control of the army, and that Dreyfus himself showed how they would use it for traitorous purposes. Further, reactionaries of all kinds joined the anti-Dreyfus party: Monarchists, anxious to discredit the Republic, that thus they might profit; so-called Nationalists, anxious to change the government along the lines of Boulangism and to adopt a vigorous foreign policy. On the other hand, there rallied to the defense of Dreyfus those who believed in his innocence, those who denounced the hatred of a race as a relic of barbarism, those who believed that the military should be subordinate to the civil authority and should not regard itself above the law, as these army officers were doing; all who believed that the whole opposition was merely conducting an insidious, covert, dangerous attack upon the Republic, and all who believed that clerical influence should be kept out of politics.

THE SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

Formation of the "Bloc."

One result of the Dreyfus agitation was the creation in the Chamber of Deputies of a strong coalition, called the "Bloc," which consisted of the Radical Republican and Socialist parties. This coalition has, in the main, subsisted ever since, and has controlled the government. Its first conspicuous head was Waldeck-Rousseau, a leader of the Parisian bar, a former follower of Gambetta. In October 1900, Waldeck-Rousseau, then prime minister, made a speech at Toulouse which resounded throughout France.

and which foreshadowed a policy which has filled the recent history of France. The real peril confronting France, he said, arose from the growing power of religious orders—orders of monks and nuns. "In this country, whose moral unity has for centuries constituted its strength and greatness, two classes of young people are growing up ignorant of each other until the day when they meet, so unlike as to risk not comprehending one another. Such a fact is explained only by the existence of a power which is no longer even occult, and by the constitution in the state of a rival power." By which was meant that the youth of France were growing up, divided into two classes, whose outlook upon life, whose mental processes, whose opinions concerning politics and morals were so widely at variance that the moral unity of the nation was destroyed. And the cause of this was the astonishing and dangerous growth in recent years of religious orders or Congregations, whose influence upon a considerable and increasing section of the young was highly harmful. Here was a power that was a rival of the State. Waldeck-Rousseau pointed out that these orders, not authorized under the laws of France, were growing rapidly in wealth and numbers; that between 1877 and 1900 the number of nuns had increased from 14,000 to 75,000 in orders not authorized; that the monks numbered about 190,000; that their property, held in mainmorte, estimated at about 50,000,000 francs in the middle of the century, had risen to 700,000,000 in 1880, and was more than a billion francs in 1900. This vast absorption of wealth, thus withdrawn from circulation, was an economic danger of the first importance. But the most serious feature was the activity of these orders in teaching and preaching. Waldeck-Rousseau believed that the education they gave was permeated with a spirit of hostility to the Republic; that the traditional hostility of the Roman Catholic Church to liberty was inculcated; that this Roman spirit was a menace in a country that believed in liberty; that it constituted a political danger

Question of Church and State.

Growth of religious orders.

to the State which Parliament must face; that to preserve the Republic defensive measures must be taken. Holding this opinion, the Waldeck-Rousseau ministry secured the passage, July 1, 1901, of the Law of Associations, which provided, among other things, that no religious orders should exist in France without definite authorization in each case from Parliament. It was the belief of the authors of this bill that the Roman Catholic Church was the enemy of the Republic, that it was using its every agency against the Republic, that it had latterly supported the anti-Dreyfus party in its attempt to discredit the institutions of France, as it had done formerly under MacMahon. Gambetta had, at that time, declared that *the* enemy was the clerical party. "Clericalism," said M. Combes, who succeeded Waldeck-Rousseau in 1902, "is, in fact, to be found at the bottom of every agitation and every intrigue from which Republican France has suffered during the last thirty-five years."

The Law of Associations.

Animated with this feeling the Associations Law was enforced with rigor in 1902 and 1903. Many orders refused to ask for authorization from Parliament; many which asked were refused. Tens of thousands of monks and nuns were forced to leave their institutions, which were closed. By a law of 1904 it was provided that all teaching by religious orders, even by those authorized, should cease within ten years. The State was to have a monopoly of the education of the young, in the interest of the ideals of liberalism it represented. Combes, upon whom fell the execution of this law, suppressed about five hundred teaching, preaching, and commercial orders. This policy was vehemently denounced by Catholics as persecution, as an infringement upon liberty, the liberty to teach, the liberty of parents to have their children educated in denominational schools if they preferred.

Religious orders forbidden to engage in teaching.

This, as events were to prove, was only preliminary to a far greater religious struggle which ended in the complete separation of Church and State, the disestablishment of the former, the laicization of the latter.

The relations of the Roman Catholic Church and the State down to 1905 were determined by the Concordat, concluded between Napoleon I and Pius VII in 1801, and put into force in 1802. The Concordat provided that the archbishops and bishops should be appointed by the State with the consent of the Pope; that the bishops should appoint the priests, but only with the consent of the Government; that the State should pay the salaries of the clergy, both priests and bishops, who thus became a part of the administrative system of the country. Ecclesiastical property, cathedrals, parish churches, residences of bishops and priests, and seminary buildings had all been declared the property of the nation in 1789, and still remained such, but these buildings were to be placed at the disposal of the clergy. Thus the Church was harnessed to the State, which had extensive powers over it.

The Concordat of 1801.

This system remained undisturbed throughout the nineteenth century, under the various régimes, but with the advent of the Third Republic serious friction began to develop. The Republicans believed in the thorough secularization of the State, and they were resolved that the clergy should not use their power over men's minds and consciences in opposition to the acts or principles of the Republic. In their determination to abolish ecclesiastical influence in the State, many measures were passed, between 1881 and 1903; schools were made undenominational, no clergyman might teach in them, no religious exercises might be conducted in them; prayers at the sessions of Parliament were abolished; hospitals were made secular; divorce, which had been abolished in 1814, was restored, and, as just described, the religious orders were brought into subjection to the State, and, indeed, largely dispersed. These acts were partly the reply of the Republicans to the anti-republican activity of the ecclesiastics which ran through the whole thirty years, partly the cause of that activity. The clergy were not friendly to the Republic, from which they drew their salaries.

Anti-clerical legislation.

This is unquestionable. The Pope himself recognized it when, in 1893, he urged the clergy to accept the Republic as their lawful government. Many Republicans were not only intent upon maintaining the Republic, but were anxious to undermine religion, considering it an obstacle in the way of progress, of civilization. But many who were not opposed to religion believed that religion did not concern the State, but was a private matter. They held that the State had no right to tax people for the support of a Church in which many had no belief or interest; that the State had no right to favor one denomination over another or over all others; that it must, in justice to all its citizens, be purely secular, entirely neutral toward all creeds and churches.

The clergy in the Dreyfus affair.

There was ceaseless friction, then, for thirty years between Church and State. The opposition of the Republicans was augmented by the activity of the clergy in the Dreyfus affair. Diplomatic incidents, in themselves of comparatively slight importance, brought matters to a head. In April 1904 the President of France, Loubet, went to Rome to render a visit to Victor Emmanuel III, a "usurper" in the eyes of the Pope. The latter protested to the Catholic powers of Europe against what he called "a grave offense to the Sovereign Pontiff." The French in turn resented what they regarded as an impertinent interference with their conduct of their foreign relations. Other disturbing incidents followed. These incidents did not cause the rupture; they merely furnished the occasion.

The abrogation of the Concordat.

Ever since June 1903, a parliamentary committee had been studying the problem and trying to draft a measure of separation of Church and State. A law was finally passed, December 9, 1905, which abrogated the Concordat of 1801. The State was henceforth not to pay the salaries of the clergy; on the other hand, it relinquished all rights over their appointment. It undertook to pay pensions to clergymen who had served many years, and were already well advanced in age; also to pay certain amounts to those who had

been in the priesthood for a few years only. In regard to the property, which, since 1789, had been vested in the nation, the cathedrals, churches, chapels, it was provided that these should still be at the free disposal of the Roman Catholic Church, but that they should be held and managed by so-called "Associations of Worship" (*associations cultuelles*), which were to vary in size according to the population of the community.

Associations of Worship.

The law contained many provisions designed to prevent these associations from amassing more than a given small amount of wealth by legacies, gifts, or otherwise; and to prevent the clergy, now cut off from all official connection with the State, from using their influence against the Republic. The Church must not become too powerful. It was stated that the property thus to be left in the hands of the associations amounted to over a hundred million dollars. The disestablished Church would not have to make this enormous expenditure for the construction of new places of worship. A year was given for the making of the necessary arrangements.[1]

This law was not universally condemned by the Catholics of France. Many believed that the Church should adapt itself to it, at least provisionally. Seventy-four bishops decided to give it a trial if a certain alteration could be made in the character of the Associations of Worship.

Opposition of Pius X.

It is probable that this change would have been conceded by the Government, but this was not to be tested, for Pope Pius X condemned the law of 1905 unreservedly. He declared that the fundamental principle of separation of Church and State is "an absolutely false thesis, a very pernicious error." He denounced the Associations of Worship as giving the administrative control, not "to the divinely instituted

[1] The Separation Law applied also to Protestant and Jewish churches, separating them from all connection with the State, discontinuing payment by the State of the salaries of their clergymen. These sects were in favor of the law.

hierarchy, but to an association of laymen," and declared that this was a violation of the principle on which rested the Church which "was founded by Jesus Christ."

The Pope's decision was final and decisive for all Catholics. It was based on fundamentals. No change in details could alter it. The bishops who had been willing to try the new law acquiesced in its condemnation. What would Parliament do about it? The year was running out. Would the churches be closed? If so, would not France be drawn into a lamentable religious war, the outcome of which no one could foretell? The Government was determined to avoid that contingency. The Minister of Public Worship, Briand, decided to apply to the situation a law passed in 1881 regulating the holding of public meetings. Designed for secular meetings, there was nothing to prevent its being applied to religious. It was therefore announced that priests might make use of the churches after merely filing the usual application, which should cover a whole year. This compromise also was rejected by the Pope.

Law of Jan. 2, 1907.

Parliament therefore passed a new law, promulgated January 2, 1907. By it most of the privileges guaranteed the Roman Catholic Church by the Law of 1905 were abrogated. The critical point was the keeping of the churches open for public worship. It was provided that their use should be gratuitous, and should be regulated by contracts between the priests and the prefects or mayors. These contracts would safeguard the civil ownership of the buildings, but worship would go on in them as before. This system appears to be gradually gaining lodgment in the life of France.

Separation of Church and State.

The result of this series of events and measures is this. Church and State are definitively separated. The people have apparently approved in recent elections the policy followed by their Government. Bishops and priests no longer receive salaries from the State. On the other hand they have liberties which they did not enjoy under the Concordat, such as

rights of assembly and freedom from governmental participation in appointments. The faithful must henceforth support their priests, and bear the expenses of the Church. Whether private contributions will prove sufficient remains to be seen. The churches have been left them by this practical but irrational device. Other ecclesiastical buildings, such as the palaces of bishops, the rectories of priests, and the edifices of theological seminaries, have been taken from ecclesiastical control, and are now used for educational or charitable purposes, or as government offices. The former palace of the Archbishop of Paris is at present occupied by the Minister of Labor. The famous seminary of St. Sulpice is now used in connection with the Luxembourg Museum.[1]

ACQUISITION OF COLONIES IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

The French colonial empire.

France, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, had possessed an extensive colonial empire. This she had lost to England as a result of the wars of the reign of Louis XV, the Revolution, and the Napoleonic period, and in 1815 her possessions had shrunk to a few small points, Guadaloupe and Martinique in the West Indies, St. Pierre and Miquelon, off Newfoundland, five towns on the coasts of India, of which Pondicherry was the best known, Bourbon, now called Réunion, an island in the Indian Ocean, Guiana in South America, which had few inhabitants, and Senegal in Africa. These were simply melancholy souvenirs of her once proud past, rags and tatters of a once imposing empire.

In the nineteenth century she was destined to begin again, and to create an empire of vast geographical extent, only second in importance to that of Great Britain, though vastly

[1] See the admirable and detailed article by Professor Othon Guerlac in *Political Science Quarterly*, June 1908, entitled, "Church and State in France." The best and fullest account of this subject is to be found in Debidour, L'église catholique et l'état sous la troisième république Vol. II, 231-498. Most of the important documents are appended.

inferior to that. The interest in conquests revived but slowly after 1815. France had conquered so much in Europe from 1792 to 1812 only to lose it as she had lost her colonies, that conquest in any form seemed but a futile and costly display of misdirected enterprise. Nevertheless, in time the process began anew, and each of the various régimes which have succeeded one another since 1815 has contributed to the building of the new empire.

Algeria.

The beginning was made in Algeria, on the northern coast of Africa, directly opposite France, and reached now in less than twenty-four hours from Marseilles. Algeria was nominally a part of the Turkish Empire, but the power of the Sultan was insignificant. A native Dey was the real ruler. The population consisted of Arabs, a nomadic and pastoral people, descendants of the Arabian conquerors of the seventh century, and of Berbers, an agricultural people, descendants of the natives who, more than twenty centuries before, had fought the Carthaginians. All the people were Mohammedans. The capital was an important town, Algiers.

Down to the opening of the nineteenth century Algeria, Tunis, and Tripoli, nominally parts of the Ottoman Empire, were in reality independent, and constituted the Barbary States, whose main business was piracy. But Europe was no longer disposed to see her wealth seized and her citizens enslaved until she paid their ransom. In 1816 an English fleet bombarded Algiers, released no less than 3,000 Christian captives, and destroyed piracy.

The French conquest of Algeria grew out of a dispute concerning a loan made by the Dey to the Directory in 1797. This dispute ended in insults by the Dey to France, with the result that in 1830 the latter power sent a fleet of a hundred ships, and five hundred transports across the Mediterranean, and seized the capital. France had not intended the conquest of the whole country, only the punishment of an insolent Dey, but attacks being made upon her from time to time, which she felt she must crush, she was

led on, step by step, until she had everywhere established her power. All through the reign of Louis Philippe this process was going on. Its chief feature was an intermittent struggle of fourteen years with a native leader, Abd-el-Kader, who proclaimed and fought a Holy War against the intruder. In the end (1847) he was forced to surrender, and France had added what is still her most important colony. This is also another episode in the dismemberment of the Turkish Empire, whose disintegration in Europe, in the Balkan peninsula, is elsewhere described.

Other African conquests.

Under Napoleon III, the beginning of conquest in another part of Africa was made. France had possessed, since the time of Louis XIII and Richelieu, one or two miserable ports on the western coast, St. Louis the most important. Under Napoleon III, the annexation of the Senegal valley was largely carried through by the efforts of the governor, Faidherbe, who later distinguished himself in the Franco-German war. Under Napoleon III also, a beginning was made in another part of the world, in Asia. The persecution of Christian natives, and the murder of certain French missionaries gave Napoleon the pretext to attack the king of Annam, whose kingdom was in the peninsula that juts out from southeastern Asia. After eight years of intermittent fighting France acquired from the king the whole of Cochin-China (1858-67), and also established a protectorate over the kingdom of Cambodia, directly north.

Cochin-China.

Thus, by 1870, France had staked out an empire of about 700,000 square kilometers, containing a population of about six million.

Expansion under the Third Republic.

Under the present Republic the work of expansion and consolidation has been carried much further than under all of the preceding régimes. There have been extensive annexations in northern Africa, western Africa, the Indian Ocean, and in Indo-China.

In northern Africa, Tunis has passed under the control of France. This was one of the Barbary states, and was

nominally a part of the Turkish Empire, with a Bey as sovereign. After establishing herself in Algeria, France desired to extend her influence eastward, over this neighboring state. But Italy, now united, began about 1870 to entertain a similar ambition. France, therefore, under the ministry of Jules Ferry, an ardent believer in colonial expansion, sent troops into Tunis in 1881, which forced the Bey to accept a French protectorate over his state. The French have not annexed Tunis formally, but they control it absolutely through a Resident at the court of the Bey, whose advice the latter is practically obliged to follow.

Western Africa.

In western Africa, France has made extensive annexations in the Senegal, Guinea, Dahomey, the Ivory coast, and the region of the Niger, and north of the Congo. By occupying the oases in the Sahara she has established her claims to that vast but hitherto unproductive area. This process has covered many years of the present Republic. The result is the existence of French authority over most of northwest Africa, from Algeria on the Mediterranean, to the Congo river. This region south of Algeria is called the French Soudan, and comprises an area seven or eight times as large as France, with a population of some fourteen millions, mainly blacks. There is some discussion of a Trans-Saharan railroad to bind these African possessions more closely together.

In Asia, the Republic has imposed her protectorate over the kingdom of Annam (1883) and has annexed Tonkin, taken from China after considerable fighting (1885). In the Indian Ocean, she has conquered Madagascar, an island larger than France herself, with a population of two and a half million. A protectorate was imposed upon that country in 1895, after ten years of disturbance, but after quelling a rebellion that broke out the following year, the protectorate was abolished, and the island was made a French colony.

Madagascar.

Thus, at the opening of the twentieth century, the empire

of France is eleven times larger than France itself, has an area of six million square kilometers, and a population of about fifty millions, and a rapidly growing commerce. Most of this empire is located in the tropics, and is ill adapted to the settlement of Europeans. Algeria and Tunis, however, offer conditions favorable for such settlements. They constitute the most valuable French possessions.

CHAPTER XVI

THE KINGDOM OF ITALY

The Kingdom of Italy, as we have seen, was established in 1859 and 1860. Venetia was acquired in 1866, and Rome in 1870. In these cases, as in the preceding, the people were allowed to express their wishes by a vote, which, in both instances, was nearly unanimous in favor of the annexation; in the former case by about 647,000 votes to 60; in the latter by about 130,000 to 1,500.

Difficulties confronting the new kingdom.

The new kingdom had to face problems of the gravest and most varied character, problems which the struggle for unity, so absorbing, had obscured, but which now appeared in all their saliency. Political unity had been gained, but not moral unity. "We have united Italy," said D'Azeglio in 1861, "now let us unite Italians," by which was meant that peoples differing in their historical evolution, in their institutions, in their economic life, in their temperaments, and which had for centuries regarded each other with indifference or animosity, must be made to feel that they were one. These peoples had never been united since the fall of Rome, and Venetians, Sicilians, Tuscans, Romans, Piedmontese, differed profoundly. The contrast was sharpest between the north and the south. They were like two different countries. "To harmonize north and south," said Cavour, "is harder than fighting with Austria or struggling with Rome." A fusion of such dissimilar elements could only be slowly achieved, and must be the result of many forces. But it must imperatively be the first object of Italian statesmen to create a common patriotism, and mutual interests.

Since 1815 there had been several states, each with its own government, its own diplomatic corps, its own courts, system of taxation, its own tariff, and coinage. This variety could not be preserved in the new kingdom, which was not a federal state, like Germany, but a single government, unitary. Only one section had had training in parliamentary government, Piedmont, and that only since 1848. The others had been under despotisms, severe as in Naples, enlightened as in Tuscany. Piedmont had accomplished the great work of unification, yet it was not, like Prussia, larger than all the other states combined, but was a mere fraction of four or five millions out of twenty-two or more. It could not, therefore, impose its will upon the others as Prussia could upon Germany. Could elements so dissimilar, men so little likely to understand each other's point of view, so little dominated by the same ideals, work together effectively? Might they not tear down the whole edifice, the mere shell of which had been so painfully erected? Now that Italy was united, it must be thoroughly transformed that it might continue. "Unify to improve," said Cavour, "improve to consolidate." A work of organization, so vast and varied, would need, not years, but generations. In 1870, after the fall of Rome, Victor Emmanuel showed that he understood the situation. "Italy is united and free; it remains for us henceforth to make her great and happy." This was the programme of the Government.

Piedmont alone accustomed to constitutional government.

This work, begun in 1861, has continued ever since, marked by notable achievements, by distressing failures, but, on the whole, by distinct and great progress. Only certain features of the later story can be indicated here.

The work of construction was undertaken earnestly. In 1861 the Constitution of Piedmont was adopted, with slight variations, as the Constitution of Italy. There was to be a parliament of two chambers, a Senate and a Chamber of Deputies. The suffrage for the latter was to be the same as it had been for the Lower House in Piedmont. The full

The Constitution.

parliamentary system was introduced, ministers representing the will of the Lower Chamber and controlled by it, legislation enacted by the two Houses. The first capital was Turin, then Florence in 1865, and finally Rome since 1871. The kingdom was divided for administrative purposes into fifty-nine districts, resembling the French departments, which were increased to sixty-nine after the annexation of Venetia and Rome. This broke up the old provincial lines, centralized the state, by giving the appointment of all prefects and mayors of cities to the national government, tended to destroy the spirit of local individuality, and to exalt Italy and Italian patriotism.

The question of the Papacy.

The most perplexing question confronting the new kingdom concerned its relations to the Papacy. The Italian Kingdom had seized, by violence, the city of Rome, over which the Popes had ruled in uncontested right for a thousand years. Rome had this peculiarity over all other cities, that it was the capital of Catholics the world over. Any attempt to expel the Pope from the city or to subject him to the House of Savoy would everywhere arouse the faithful, already clamorous, and might cause an intervention in behalf of the restoration of the temporal power. There were henceforth to be two sovereigns, one temporal, one spiritual, within the same city. The situation was absolutely unique and extremely delicate. It was considered necessary to determine their relations before the government was transferred to Rome. It was impossible to reach any agreement with the Pope, as he refused to recognize the Kingdom of Italy, but spoke of Victor Emmanuel simply as the King of Sardinia, and would make no concessions in regard to his own rights in Rome. Parliament, therefore, passed in Florence, May 13, 1871, the Law of Papal Guarantees, a remarkable act defining the relations of Church and State in Italy.

The Law of Papal Guarantees.

The object of this law was to carry out Cavour's principle of a "free Church in a free State," to reassure Catholics that the new kingdom had no intention of controlling in

any way the spiritual activities of the Pope, though taking from him his temporal powers. Catholics must feel that the Pope was no creature of the Italian government, but had entire liberty of action in governing the Church. Consequently his person is declared sacred and inviolable. Any attacks upon him are, by this law, to be punished exactly as are similar attacks upon the King. He has his own diplomatic corps, and receives diplomatic representatives from other countries. He has his court, the Curia Romana, as the King has his. That he may communicate with the outside world directly, and not through agencies controlled by the Kingdom, he has his own independent postal and telegraph service. Certain places are set apart as entirely under his sovereignty: the Vatican, the Lateran, Castel Gandolfo, and their gardens. Here no Italian official may enter, in his official capacity, for Italian law and administration stop outside these limits. A similar exemption holds wherever a conclave or a church council is held. In return for the income lost with the temporal power, the Pope is granted 3,225,000 francs a year by the Italian Kingdom. This law has been faithfully observed by the Italian government. But neither Pius IX, nor Leo XIII, nor Pius X has been willing to accept it. The Pope considers himself the "prisoner of the Vatican," and since 1870 has not left it to go into the streets of Rome, as he would thereby be tacitly recognizing the existence of another ruler there, the "usurper." The Pope has never accepted the annuity. He has even forbidden Catholics to vote in national elections, or to accept national offices, as that would be a recognition that an Italian nation exists. They may vote in municipal elections. Municipalities existed long before the Kingdom.

The Curia Romana.

The "prisoner of the Vatican."

The Pope has never recognized the existence of the kingdom, and the solution of the question of the relations of the Church and the State seems as remote as ever. The statement of Victor Emmanuel on entering the city as sovereign, July 2, 1871, still describes the situation. "Yes, we are

in Rome, and we shall remain." The Italian Government has never feared the Pope, but it did for several years fear an intervention of Catholic powers, a danger which, with the lapse of time, has practically disappeared.

Another difficult problem for the Kingdom was its financial status. The debts of the different states were assumed by it and were large. The nation was also obliged to make large expenditures on the army and the navy, on fortifications, and on public works, particularly on the building of railways, which were essential to the economic prosperity of the country as well as conducive to the strengthening of the sense of common nationality. There were, for several years, large annual deficits, necessitating new loans, which, of course, augmented the public debt. Heroically did successive ministers seek to make both ends meet, not shrinking from new and unpopular taxes, or from the seizure and sale of monastic lands. Success was finally achieved, and in 1879 the receipts exceeded the expenditures.

Death of Victor Emmanuel II.

In 1878 Victor Emmanuel II died and was buried in the Pantheon, one of the few ancient buildings of Rome. Over his tomb is the inscription, "To the Father of his Country." He was succeeded by his son Humbert I, then thirty-four years of age. A month later Pius IX died, and was succeeded by Leo XIII, at the time of his election sixty-eight years of age. But nothing was changed by this change of personalities. Each maintained the system of his predecessor. Leo XIII, Pope from 1878 to 1903, following the precedent set by Pius IX, never recognized the Kingdom of Italy, nor did he ever leave the Vatican. He, too, considered himself a prisoner of the "robber king."

The educational problem.

Another urgent problem confronting the new kingdom was that of the education of its citizens. This was most imperative if the masses of the people were to be fitted for the freer and more responsible life opened by the political revolution. The preceding governments had grossly neglected this duty. In 1861 over seventy-five per cent. of

the population of the Kingdom were illiterate. In Naples and Sicily, the most backward in development of all the sections of Italy, the number of illiterates exceeded ninety per cent. of the population; and in Piedmont and Lombardy, the most advanced sections, one-third of the men and more than half of the women could neither read nor write. "Without national education there exists morally no nation," Mazzini had said. "The national conscience cannot be awakened except by its aid. Without national education, common to all citizens, the equality of civic duties and rights is an empty formula."

In 1877 a compulsory education law was passed. This was extended by a new law passed in 1904. But as the support of primary schools rests with the communes, and as, in many cases, they have evaded their responsibility, the system of universal education has not been established in practice. Italy has done much during the last thirty years, but much remains to be done. Illiteracy, though diminishing, is still widely prevalent. Recent statistics show that forty per cent. of the recruits in the army are illiterate. Satisfactory results will probably not be obtained until the Government itself assumes the support and direction of the schools instead of leaving them in the hands of the local authorities.

Extension of the suffrage.

In 1882 an electoral reform, which had long been discussed, was passed. Hitherto the suffrage had been limited to property-holders twenty-five years of age and older, paying an annual tax of at least forty lire. Under this system less than two and a half per cent. of the population possessed the right to vote. So widespread was illiteracy that it was not considered wise to proclaim universal suffrage. The property qualification was now reduced from forty lire to nineteen lire eighty centesimi, and the age qualification was lowered to twenty-one, and an additional method of securing the franchise was also established, namely an educational qualification. All men of twenty-one who have

had a primary school education were given the franchise. This reform more than tripled the number of voters at once, from 627,838 to 2,049,461. Of these about two-thirds secured the right through meeting the educational qualification. While, therefore, the suffrage is not universal it tends to become so with the spread of elementary education.

The Triple Alliance.

This period of internal reforms was interrupted by foreign politics. In 1882 Italy entered the alliance with Germany and Austria. The reasons were various: pique at France, dread of intervention in behalf of the Pope, and a desire to appear as one of the great powers of Europe. The result was that she was forced to spend larger sums upon her army, remodeled along Prussian lines, and her navy, thus disturbing her finances once more.

Italy now embarked upon another expensive and hazardous enterprise, the acquisition of colonies, influenced in this direction by the prevalent fashion, and by a desire to rank among the world powers. Shut out of Tunis, her natural field, by France, she, in 1885, seized positions on the Red Sea, particularly the port of Massawa. Two years later she consequently found herself at war with Abyssinia. The minister who had inaugurated this movement, Depretis, died

Francesco Crispi.

in 1887. He was succeeded by Crispi, one of the few striking personalities Italian politics have produced since the time of Cavour. Crispi threw himself heartily into the colonial scheme, extended the claims of Italy in East Africa, and tried to play off one native leader against another. To the new colony he gave the name of Eritrea. At the same time an Italian protectorate was established over a region in eastern Africa called Somaliland. But all this involved long and expensive campaigns against the natives. Italy was trying to play the rôle of a great power when

Ambitious military and colonial policy.

her resources did not warrant it. The consequence of this aggressive and ambitious military, naval, and colonial policy was the creation again of a deficit in the state's finances, which increased alarmingly. The deficits of four years,

ending January 1, 1891, amounted to the enormous sum of over seventy-five million dollars. To meet the situation new taxes had to be imposed upon a people already heavily overburdened. The reaction of this upon internal politics was disastrous. The resultant economic distress expressed itself in deep dissatisfaction with the monarchy, and in the growth of republican and socialistic parties. Riots broke out in 1889 in Turin, Milan, Rome, and in the southern province of Apulia. Crispi adopted a policy of stern repression, which restored quiet on the surface, but left a widespread feeling of rancor behind. He fell from office in 1891, but, his successor being unable to improve the financial situation and the internal conditions of the country, he came back into power in 1893 and ruled practically as a dictator until 1896. His policy was the same as before, vigorous repression of all opposition to the existing system. He made no attempt to remove the causes of discontent.

The resultant distress.

Policy of repression.

But Crispi only gave fuller range to his excessive ambitions in the colonial field. Extending the field of occupation in East Africa he aroused the bitter opposition of Menelek, ruler of Abyssinia. The result was disastrous. The Italian army of 14,000 under Baratieri, was overwhelmed in 1896 by Menelek with 80,000, no less than 6,000 of the Italian troops perishing. This crushing defeat sealed the doom of Crispi, who immediately resigned. The Marquis di Rudini became prime minister and attempted a policy of pacification. Italy renounced her extreme claims, restricted her colonial area, and secured the release of the soldiers who were prisoners of war in the hands of Menelek. The repressive policy at home was abandoned, and an attempt was made to investigate the causes of discontent. But this policy was suddenly cut short by formidable and sanguinary riots that broke out in various parts of Italy in May 1898. The movement was general, though most bloody in Milan. Its cause was the wretchedness of the people, which in turn was largely occasioned by the heavy taxation resulting from

War with Abyssinia.

these unwise attempts to play an international rôle hopelessly out of proportion to the country's resources. In the south and center the movement took the form of "bread riots," but in the north it was distinctly revolutionary. "Down with the dynasty," was a cry heard there. All these movements were suppressed by the Government, but only after much bloodshed. They indicated widespread distress and dissatisfaction with existing conditions.

Assassination of Humbert I.

In July 1900, King Humbert was assassinated by an Italian anarchist who went to Italy for that purpose from Paterson, New Jersey. Humbert was succeeded by his son Victor Emmanuel III, then in his thirty-first year.

Victor Emmanuel III.

The new King had been carefully educated and soon showed that he was a man of intelligence, of energy, and of firmness of will. He won the favor of his subjects by the simplicity of his mode of life, by his evident sense of duty, and by his sincere interest in the welfare of the people, shown in many spontaneous and unconventional ways. He became forthwith a more decisive factor in the government than his father had been. He was a democratic monarch, indifferent to display, laborious, vigorous. The opening decade of the twentieth century was characterized by a new spirit which, in a way, reflected the buoyancy, and hopefulness, and courage of the young King. But the causes of the new optimism were deeper than the mere change of rulers and lay in the growing prosperity of the nation, a prosperity, which, despite appearances, had been for some years preparing and which was now witnessed on all sides. The worst was evidently over. The national finances were being conservatively managed. Since 1897 the receipts have constantly been larger than the expenses. Between 1901 and 1907 the surpluses were successively thirty-two, sixty-nine, thirty-three, forty-seven, sixty-three, and one hundred and one, million lire. This situation, so highly creditable, was brought about by strict economy and by heavy taxation. The market price of the five per cent. bonds, which had fallen

as low as seventy-two in 1894, rose to par and above par. A beginning was also made in the imperative work of reducing taxes and of shifting somewhat their incidence, which was grossly unjust to the poorer classes.

Industrial expansion.

These facts were full of encouragement, but they represented an effect as well as a cause. Behind a flourishing budget stood an expanding economic activity. Italy was becoming an industrial nation. This is the vital fact in the situation to-day. Metallurgy has made such progress in recent years that in the two lines of naval and railway construction Italy is no longer dependent upon foreign countries. The development of these two industries has given a powerful impulse to activity in other directions. The silk and cotton and chemical manufactures have rapidly advanced. The merchant marine has greatly increased.

More remarkable than the progress made in the last twenty years, and more engaging the public attention, is the progress that seems destined in the future, and for this reason: industry depended, up to the close of the nineteenth century, upon steam and steam depends upon coal. Italy is at a great disadvantage compared with other countries because she lacks the two indispensable elements—coal and iron—which she is therefore obliged to import. This is a tremendous handicap. But the last two decades of the century revealed to the world the possibility of the use of electricity as a source of energy for industrial pursuits. From electricity, "white coal," as it is sometimes called, Italy expects her transformation into a great industrial power for, while Nature has refused her coal, she has given her immense water power in the streams which flow rapidly from the Alps and Apennines. It has been estimated that the amount of energy she can draw from this source will be from three to five million horse-power. The motive power used in the manufacturing establishments of the United States in 1900 was, according to the census report, eleven million, three hundred thousand horse-power. It is appropriate that the land of Volta and

Advent of the age of electricity.

Galvani should see her future in the new agency which is already profoundly altering the conditions of modern industry and which her mountain streams will furnish her so abundantly.

Increase of the population.

This transformation into a great industrial state is not only possible but is necessary, owing to her rapidly increasing population, which has grown, since 1870, from about 25,000,000 to nearly 35,000,000. The birth rate is higher than that of any other country of Europe. But during the same period the emigration from Italy has been large and has steadily increased. Official statistics show that, between 1876 and 1905, over eight million persons emigrated, of whom over four million went to various South American countries, especially Argentina, and to the United States. Perhaps half of the total number have returned to their native land, for much of the emigration is of a temporary character. Emigration has increased greatly under the present reign, while the economic conditions of the country have begun to show improvement. This is explained by the fact that the industrial revival described above has not yet affected southern Italy and Sicily, whence the large proportion of the emigrants come. From those parts which have experienced that revival the emigration is not large. Only by an extensive growth of industries can this emigration be stopped or at least rendered normal. Italy finds herself in the position in which Germany was for many years, losing hundreds of thousands of her citizens each year. With the expansion of German industries the outgoing stream grew less until, in 1908, it practically ceased, owing to the fact that her mines and factories had so far developed as to give employment to all.

Problem of emigration.

Though the conditions of Italian life present many grave problems, yet it is clear that the prosperity of the country is increasing. Discontent is not as widespread or as clamorous as at the close of the nineteenth century. Even the enormous emigration is not evidence exclusively of poverty,

but is, to some extent, due to the ease and cheapness of our present means of communication, and bears witness to the difference between Italian wages and foreign wages, to the fact that the labor market to-day is mobile, is, in fact, a world market. Victor Emmanuel III, by associating himself actively with all works of national betterment, has strengthened the hold of the monarchy upon the people. The republican agitation appears moribund. And the governing classes of the state have profited by their mistakes, and have learned the truth of Cavour's assertion—that the first attribute of a statesman is "tact to discern the possible."

Italia rediviva!

CHAPTER XVII

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY SINCE 1849

AUSTRIA TO THE COMPROMISE OF 1867

Austria's punishment of Hungary.

Austria, perilously near dissolution in 1848, torn by revolutions in Bohemia, Hungary, the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom, and its influence in Germany temporarily paralyzed, had emerged triumphant from the storm, and by 1850 was in a position to impose her will once more upon her motley group of states. She learned no lesson from the fearful crisis just traversed, but at once entered upon a course of reaction of the old familiar kind. Absolutism was everywhere restored. Italy was ruled with an iron hand, Prussia was humiliated in a most emphatic manner at Olmütz, the German Confederation was restored, and Austrian primacy in it conspicuously reaffirmed. Hungary felt the full weight of Austrian displeasure. She was considered to have forfeited by her rebellion the old historic rights she had possessed for centuries. Her Diet was abolished, her local self-government, in her county assemblies, was suppressed, Croatia, Transylvania, and the Servian country were severed from her, and the Kingdom itself was cut up into five sections, each ruled separately. Hungary was henceforth governed from Vienna and largely by Germans. She was for the next few years simply a vassal of Austria, whose policy was to crush and extinguish all traces of her separate nationality. Francis Joseph, however, found it in the end impossible to break the spirit of the Magyars, who bent beneath the autocrat but did not abate their claims. During the revolution, Francis Joseph had granted a constitution to the whole Empire (March 4, 1849). This was revoked

December 31, 1851 "in the name of the unity of the empire and monarchical principles." For ten years absolutism and centralization prevailed throughout the dominions of the youthful ruler. One achievement of the revolution remained untouched, the abolition of feudalism, the liberation of the peasantry, a great economic and social change benefiting millions of people.

Failure of the war in Italy.

To perpetuate a system of this character the Government must sedulously avoid any disaster that would weaken its power, any crisis in which it would need the support of all its subjects. This it did not do. The crisis of 1859, the failure of that year in Italy, sealed the doom of a system universally odious, and which was now seen to be unable to maintain the integrity of the Empire. As a result of the war Austria was forced to cede Lombardy to Piedmont, and afterward to remain inactive while the Italians made waste paper of the Treaty of Zurich, which she had concluded with France. She was compelled to continue this passive attitude because of the utter demoralization of her finances, and particularly because of the threatening situation in Hungary. Austria's distress was Hungary's opportunity. Thousands of Hungarians had joined the armies opposed to her, and rebellion was likely to break forth at any moment in Hungary itself. Peace had to be secured at any price.

Francis Joseph reverses his policy.

This time the Austrian government profited by experience. In order to increase the strength of the state by actively interesting his various peoples in it so that they would be willing to make sacrifices for it, Francis Joseph resolved to break with the previous policy of his reign, to sweep away abuses, redress grievances, and introduce liberal reforms. But the problem was exceedingly complicated, and was only slowly worked out after several experiments had been tried which had resulted in failure. The chief difficulty lay in the adjustment of the claims of the different races over which he ruled. How could these be granted, and

yet the power of the monarchy remain strong, Austria remain a great European power, able to speak decisively in European councils? Opinion was divided as to the method to pursue. There were at least two parties—those who wished to emphasize the principle of federalism in the government, and those who wished to emphasize the principle of unity. The federalists demanded that the equality of all the countries within the Empire should be recognized, that each should make its own internal laws, and should administer them. Austria would then be a federal state with home rule as the recognized basis of the government of the several parts, and with a central parliament for purely imperial affairs. The other party, emphasizing the idea of unity, believed that the central government should possess large powers in order to play a commanding rôle among the European states. That the unity of the Empire might be preserved, and emphasized home rule should be limited in scope, the central government must be endowed with great authority.

Federalism or centralization?

Austria becomes a constitutional state.

The Emperor at first tried the federal system in 1860. This experiment not working to his satisfaction, he inaugurated a new system in 1861. Under this there was to be a parliament for the whole Empire, divided into two chambers, meeting annually. Its functions were important. The two chambers were to be a House of Lords, appointed by the Emperor, and a House of Representatives of 343 members to be chosen by the local diets. (Hungary 85, Transylvania 20, Croatia ,9, Bohemia 54, Moravia 22, Galicia 38). The local diets were to continue for local affairs but with reduced powers. By this constitution, granted by the Emperor, Austria became a constitutional monarchy. Absolutism as a form of government was abandoned.

Hungary refuses to co-operate.

But this constitution was a failure, and chiefly because of the attitude of the Hungarians. To the first parliament Hungary declined to send representatives, an attitude she maintained steadily for several years until a new arrange-

ment was made satisfactory to her. Why did she refuse to recognize a constitution that represented a great advance in liberalism over anything the Empire had known before? Why did she refuse to send representatives to a parliament in which she would have weight in proportion to the number of her inhabitants? Why did she steadily refuse to accept an arrangement that seemed both liberal and fair?

It must be constantly remembered that Hungary consists of several races, and that of these races the Magyars have always been the dominant one, though in a numerical minority. This dominant race was divided into two parties, one of irreconcilables, men who bitterly hated Austria, who would listen to no compromise with her, whose ideal was absolute independence. These men, however, were not now in control. They were discredited by the failures of 1849. The leaders of Hungary were now the moderate liberals, at whose head stood Francis Deák, the wisest and most influential Hungarian statesman of the nineteenth century. These men were willing to compromise with Austria on the question of giving the requisite strength to the government of the whole Empire to enable it to play its rôle as a great European power, but they were absolutely firm in their opposition to the constitution just granted by Francis Joseph, and immovable in their determination to secure the legal rights of Hungary. Their reasons for opposing the new constitution, which promised so vast an improvement upon the old unprogressive absolutism that had reigned for centuries, for thwarting the Emperor, who was frankly disposed to enter the path of liberalism, are most important.

Reasons for her refusal.

They asserted that Hungary had always been a separate nation, united with Austria simply in the person of the monarch, who was king in Hungary as he was emperor in his own hereditary states; that he was king in Hungary only after he had taken an oath to support the fundamental laws of Hungary, and had been crowned in Hungary with the iron crown of St. Stephen; that these fundamental laws and

The Hungarians assert their "historic rights."

institutions were in part centuries old, had in a sense been redefined in the laws of 1848, which Ferdinand I had formally accepted in their new statement; that no change could be made without the consent of both contracting parties; that the Emperor-King as merely one party to the contract had no right to alter them in jot or tittle by any exercise of his own power; that they were therefore still the law of the land; that Hungary was an historic state, with definite boundaries, including Transylvania and Croatia; "that a people which has had a past is never able to forget its history"; that the new constitution was one "granted" by Francis Joseph, and if granted, might be withdrawn; that whatever its abstract merits were, it was unacceptable by reason of its origin; that, moreover, it was designed for the whole Empire, and that its effect was to make Hungary a mere province of Austria; that what was wanted was not *a* constitution, but *the* constitution of Hungary, which had, since 1848, been illegally suspended.

And demand the restoration of their constitution.

This party differed from the revolutionary party of 1848 and 1849 in that it recognized that the times did not permit a merely "personal" union of Austria and Hungary, but that the interests of each demanded a certain "real" union, a certain strength for the central government that should enable it to act with decision and authority in foreign affairs, and the party was prepared to make concessions enough to render this possible. Only, the concessions must come later, after the Emperor had formally recognized the historic rights of Hungary, and must come then only after fair discussion. The unity represented by the new parliament it would never consent to. In that assembly it would be a minority outnumbered by "foreigners," for all the other peoples of the Empire were, in its eyes, foreigners; it would not fuse its individuality in the general mass of all the inhabitants; it was determined to preserve the historic personality of Hungary. Francis Joseph must first consider

himself personally bound to accede to the laws of 1848, which his predecessor, Ferdinand, had ratified.

The new experiment of an imperial parliament finally broke down beneath the impact of this persistent Hungarian refusal to accept it. For four years, from 1861 to 1865, there was a deadlock, neither side giving way. The condition of the country grew worse, the deficit continued to increase. The Emperor, recognizing the failure of his plans, recognizing that Hungary was really a separate nation,—strongly conscious of her own distinct history and personality and utterly unwilling to enter a unified monarchy however liberal,—finally determined to adapt himself to the situation. Negotiations were begun with the Hungarians, the object of which was to harmonize their claims with the unity and power of the Empire. These negotiations began in 1865, were interrupted in 1866 by the Austro-Prussian war, and were completed in 1867. Indeed, the war facilitated the great work, as showing once more how heavy was the cost to the Empire of Hungarian disaffection, how imperative it was for the power of the monarchy that Hungary should be contented. Moreover, as by that war Austria was expelled from Germany, it was imperative for the monarchy to gain additional strength elsewhere. The negotiations resulted accordingly, in 1867, in the Compromise or *Ausgleich*, which is the basis of the Empire to-day. It was accepted by the Emperor and the Parliaments of both countries. Francis Joseph was in the same year crowned King of Hungary.

A deadlock.

Francis Joseph yields.

The Compromise of 1867.

Thus was created a curious kind of state defying classification. Neither federalism nor unity was the outcome of the long constitutional struggle, but dualism. The Empire was henceforth to be called Austria-Hungary, and was to be a dual monarchy. Austria-Hungary consists of two distinct, independent states, which stand in law upon a plane of complete equality. They have the same flag. They have the same ruler, who in Austria bears the title of Emperor,

The Dual Monarchy.

in Hungary that of King. Each has its own parliament, its own ministry, its own administration. Each governs itself in all internal affairs absolutely without interference from the other.

But the two are united, not simply in the person of the monarch. They are united for certain affairs regarded as common to both. There is a joint ministry composed of three departments: Foreign Affairs, War, and Finance. Each state has its own parliament, but there is no parliament in common. In order then to have a body that shall supervise the work of the three joint ministries there was established the system of "delegations." Each parliament chooses a delegation of sixty of its members. These delegations meet alternately in Vienna and Budapest. They are really committees of the two parliaments. They sit and debate separately, each using its own language, and they communicate with each other in writing. If after three communications no decision has been reached a joint session is held in which the question is settled without debate by a mere majority vote.

The Delegations.

Other affairs, which in most countries are considered common to all parts, such as tariff and currency systems, do not fall within the competence of the joint ministry or the delegations. They are to be regulated by agreements concluded between the two parliaments for periods of ten years, an awkward arrangement creating an intense strain every decade, for the securing of these agreements is most difficult.

The Compromise satisfactory only to the dominant races.

This Compromise was satisfactory only to the Germans and the Magyars, each the dominant party in its section, but each also in a numerical minority.

One of the important results therefore of the expulsion of Austria from Germany after the Austro-Prussian war of 1866 was the internal transformation of the Austrian Empire itself. The German element in that state was weakened, the Hungarians had to be appeased, and as a conse-

quence the Ausgleich or Compromise of 1867 was worked out. By this the former Austrian Empire was divided into two states, the Empire of Austria and the Kingdom of Hungary, the two together known henceforth as Austria-Hungary. The small river Leitha forms in part the boundary between the two, Hungary being known as Transleithania, Austria as Cisleithania. The capital of Austria is Vienna; of Hungary, Budapest. The Constitution of the collective state is the Compromise of 1867, already described. Each state also possesses a constitution of its own. In Austria the Constitution of 1861 was liberally revised by five laws passed in 1867, by which full parliamentary government was established, the Emperor choosing his ministry from the majority party or group in Parliament. The Parliament or Reichsrath was to consist of two chambers, a House of Lords and a House of Representatives, which numbered at that time 203 members. These were chosen, not directly by the voters, but by the diets or local legislatures of each of the seventeen provinces into which Austria is divided, for each province has its local legislature for local purposes.

Constitution of Austria.

In Hungary the Constitution of 1848 was restored, with some alterations. Thus Hungary had a parliament of two chambers, the Table of Magnates, composed chiefly of nobles, and the Table of Deputies, elected directly by the voters, all males twenty years of age and paying a certain amount in taxes. Though this amount was small it resulted in the exclusion of about three-fourths of the adult males. Thus in neither state did universal suffrage exist. A demand for this has since been repeatedly made in both countries with results that will appear later.

Constitution of Hungary.

Neither of the two states had a homogeneous population. In each there was a dominant race, the Germans in Austria, the Magyars in Hungary. The Compromise of 1867 was satisfactory to these alone. In each country there were subordinate and rival races, jealous of the supremacy of these two, anxious for recognition and for power, and ren-

The dominant races.

dered more insistent by the sight of the remarkable success of the Magyars in asserting their individuality. In Hungary there were Croatia, Slavonia, and Transylvania; in Austria there were seventeen provinces, each with its own diet, representing almost always a variety of races. Some of these, notably Bohemia, had in former centuries had a separate statehood, which they wished to recover; others were gaining an increasing self-consciousness, and desired a future controlled by themselves and in their own interests.

Divisive effect of the principle of nationality in Austria-Hungary.

The struggles of these races were destined to form the most important feature of Austrian history during the next forty years. It should be noted that the principle of nationality, so effective in bringing about the unification of Italy and Germany, has tended in Austria in precisely the opposite direction, the splitting up of a single state into many. Dualism was established in 1867, but these subordinate races refuse to acquiesce in that as a final form. They wish to change the dual into a federal state, which shall give free play to the several nationalities. The fundamental struggle all these years has been between these two principles—dualism and federalism. These racial and nationalistic struggles have been most confusing, crossing each other in various ways, and rendered more complex by their connection with other forces, such as liberalism, clericalism, socialism. In the interest of clearness, only a few of the more important can be treated here.

The Empire of Austria and the Kingdom of Hungary, having had different histories since 1867, may best be treated separately.

THE EMPIRE OF AUSTRIA SINCE 1867

Austria since 1867.

The first years in Austria under her new constitution were years of liberal reforms. The constitution guaranteed complete religious liberty. To give effect to this guarantee laws were passed greatly restricting the powers of the Roman Catholic Church. Henceforth all forms of religion were

on a basis of legal equality; each person might freely choose his church and that of his children, or might decline connection with any. The public schools were to be open to all citizens without regard to creed. Churches might maintain schools of their own if they wished to. A form of marriage by civil authorities was established for those cases in which the priest refused to officiate. By these laws religious liberty and secular education were established. The Pope denounced them as "abominable," and declared them null and void "for the present and the future." Despite these fulminations they went into force. **Liberal legislation.**

At this time also other useful laws were passed, regulating the finances, altering the judicial system, and introducing trial by jury, and reorganizing the military system along the successful Prussian lines of universal military service of three years, with service in the reserve for several years longer.

At the same time the Austrian Government was confronted by questions far more baffling. Various nationalities, or would-be nationalities, demanded that they should now receive as liberal treatment as Hungary had received in the Compromise of 1867. The leaders in this movement were the Czechs of Bohemia, who, in 1868, definitely stated their position, which was precisely that of the Hungarians before 1867. They claimed that Bohemia was an historic and independent nation, united with the other states under the House of Hapsburg only in the person of the monarch. They demanded that the kingdom of Bohemia should be restored, that Francis Joseph should be crowned in Prague with the crown of Wenceslaus. **Demands of the Czechs.**

The Galicians in the north, the Slovenes and Serbs in the south, brought forward similar, though not as sweeping, demands. These groups, imitating the successful methods of the Magyars, refused to sit in the Austrian Parliament in Vienna, declining to recognize the authority of institutions in the creation of which they had had no share. The moral authority of the new Parliament was therefore greatly

The Emperor prepares to concede them.

reduced. The agitation became so great that the Emperor decided to yield to the Bohemians. On September 14, 1871, he formally recognized the historic rights of the Kingdom of Bohemia, and agreed to be crowned king in Prague, as he had been crowned king in Budapest. Arrangements were to be made whereby Bohemia should gain the same rights as Hungary, independence in domestic affairs and union with Austria and Hungary for certain general purposes. The dual monarchy was about to become a triple monarchy.

Opposition of Germans and Magyars.

But these promises were not destined to be carried out. The Emperor's plans were bitterly opposed by the Germans of Austria, who, as the dominant class and as also a minority of the whole population, feared the loss of their supremacy, feared the rise of the Slavs, whom they hated. They were bitterly opposed, also, by the Magyars of Hungary, who declared that this was undoing the Compromise of 1867, and who feared particularly that the rise of the Slavic state of Bohemia would rouse the Slavic peoples of Hungary to demand the same rights, and the Magyars were determined not to share with them their privileged position. The opposition to the Emperor's plans was consequently most emphatic and formidable. It was also pointed out that the management of foreign affairs would be much more difficult with three nations directing rather than two. The Emperor yielded to the opposition. The decree that was to place Bohemia on an equality with Austria and Hungary never came. Dualism had triumphed over federalism, to the immense indignation of those who saw the prize snatched from them. Where the Bohemians had failed, obviously the weaker groups—Galicians, Serbs—could not succeed. The Compromise of 1867 remained unchanged. The House of Hapsburg to this day rules over a dual, not over a federal state.

Triumph of dualism.

A radical change in the constitution was thus definitely rejected. Gradually the extreme demands of the various races subsided. The Czechs lost much of their power by

splitting into two groups. The constitutional régime slowly struck root. For some years it was the Germans who controlled the Austrian Parliament and the ministry. In 1873 a change was made in the electoral system. Hitherto the members of the Reichsrath, or Imperial Parliament, had been elected by the diets of the different provinces. This was objected to as giving the Reichsrath the appearance of a congress of delegates, rather than of a real parliament. Moreover, any diet, by refusing to elect delegates (as Bohemia had frequently done), could so reduce the national representation as to destroy its moral authority. The new law of 1873 withdrew this power from the provincial diets and gave it directly to those who had the right to elect the diets. Now the right to choose the members of these diets was not vested in a general mass of electors, but was vested in certain groups or classes, four in number—the landowners, the cities, the chambers of commerce, and the rural districts. Each class elected a certain number of members of the diets. It was now provided that each should henceforth elect a certain number of members of the Reichsrath. All that the change of 1873 accomplished was to substitute direct election by the four classes for indirect election by the diets. The number of members of the Reichsrath was increased from 203 to 353. The number of voters in each class and the relative weight of the individual voter varied enormously. Thus in 1890, in the class of landowners, there was one deputy to every 63 voters, one to 27 in the class of chambers of commerce, one to 2,918 in that of cities, one to 11,600 in that of rural districts. With such a system further demands for reform were inevitable, and have, as we shall see, figured prominently in later history.

Electoral reform.

The German element maintained control of the Austrian Parliament as long as it remained united, but breaking up finally into three groups, and incurring the animosity of the Emperor by constantly blocking his measures, its ministry fell in 1879, and was succeeded by one of a very different

The Taaffe ministry.

character under Taaffe. This ministry lasted fourteen years, from 1879 to 1893. While Taaffe steadily refused to alter the Constitution of 1867 in the direction of federalism, his policy nevertheless greatly stimulated the growth of the federalist spirit. Relying for parliamentary support upon the Czechs and Poles against the Germans, he was forced to make concessions to them. In Bohemia the Czechs were favored in various ways. They secured an electoral law which assured them a majority in the Bohemian Diet and in the Bohemian delegation to the Reichsrath; they obtained a university, by the division into two institutions of that of Prague, the oldest German university, founded in 1356. Thus there is a German University of Prague and a Czechish (1882). By various ordinances German was dethroned from its position as sole official language. After 1886 office-holders were required to answer the demands of the public in the language in which they were presented, either German or Czechish. This rule operated unfavorably for German officials, who were usually unable to speak Czechish, whereas the Czechs, as a rule, spoke both languages.

The Slavs favored.

In Galicia the Poles, though a minority, obtained control of the Diet, supported by the Taaffe ministry, and proceeded to oppress the Ruthenians; in Carniola the Slovenes proceeded to Slavicize the province. Thus the Slavs were favored during the long ministry of Taaffe, and the evolution of the Slavic nationalities and peoples progressed at the expense of the Germans.

Growth of radical parties.

Under this long administration the financial condition of Austria improved. The chronic deficit disappeared and receipts exceeded expenditures for the first time in many years. In social legislation the policies of Bismarck were imitated by the compulsory insurance of workingmen and the repression of Socialists, for it was also at this time that the Socialist party became prominent. This was, here as elsewhere, a radical democratic party, demanding universal suffrage, obligatory and free education, the complete laiciza-

tion of the state. This party was not local, like the racial and nationalistic groups, but was interprovincial, thus cutting across the parties already existing and increasing the confusion.

In Bohemia there was a movement in favor of democracy, which was independent of the Socialists. The Czechs had long been divided into Old and Young Czechs. They had worked together as against the Germans, but now that they were in the main victorious in this, they flew apart. The Young Czechs were a democratic party, demanding universal suffrage, secular schools, liberty of the press and of public meetings. After 1887 this party, profiting by the concessions of the Taaffe ministry, began to agitate fiercely in favor of a reconstrution of Bohemian nationality, whereas the Old Czechs were willing to abide by the Compromise of 1867. By 1891 the Young Czechs had swept the Old Czechs completely from the field. An attempt by the Government to stop this movement had resulted in total failure. The Germans of Bohemia, on the other hand, opposed with vehemence the nationalist aspirations of the Czechs. So fierce did race struggles become that in 1893 the Government was forced to proclaim the state of siege in Prague. The situation became so difficult for the Taaffe ministry that it resigned in 1893.

Division among the Czechs.

Thus racial movements and democratic movements were in full swing at the close of this long ministry. To satisfy the latter, Taaffe, just before his fall, brought forward a radical electoral reform, which would have increased the number of voters from about 1,500,000 to 4,500,000. The proposal failed, but, the agitation continuing, the succeeding ministry in 1896 carried through a more limited measure. The existing four electoral classes were left as they were; but a fifth class was created, which was to elect 72 additional members to Parliament. This class was to include all men of twenty-four years of age or older. It included, therefore, all those of the four other classes, members of which, conse-

Electoral reform.

quently, posssessed under the new system a double vote. The result was to make the system of representation more complex than ever, without giving numbers anything like their due weight. Thus five million and a half voters would choose 72 members, whereas the 1,700,000 voters of the four other classes would choose 353; the class of great landed proprietors, numbering only about 5,000, would choose 85 members. Obviously, such a system would not satisfy the growing demand for a democratic suffrage. It was a mere temporary expedient.

Universal suffrage.

The agitation for universal suffrage continued to increase during the next decade, and was finally successful. By the law of January 26, 1907, all men in Austria over twenty-four were given the right to vote, and the class system was abolished. The most striking result of the first elections on this popular basis (May 1907) was the return of 87 Socialists, who polled 1,041,948 votes, nearly a third of those cast. This party had previously had only about a dozen representatives. The race parties, such as the Young Czechs, lost heavily. Whether this means that the period of extreme racial rivalry is over and the struggle of social classes is to be the feature of the future, the future only will show.

THE KINGDOM OF HUNGARY SINCE 1867

Hungary, a country larger than Austria, larger than Great Britain, found her historic individuality definitely recognized and guaranteed by the Compromise of 1867. She had successfully resisted all attempts to merge her with the other countries subject to the House of Hapsburg. She is an independent kingdom under the crown of St. Stephen. The sole official language is Magyar, which is neither Slavic nor Teutonic, but Turanian in origin.

The political history of Hungary since the Compromise has been much more simple than that of Austria. Race and language questions have been fundamental, but they have been decided in a summary manner. The ruling race in

1867 was the Magyar, and it has remained the ruling race. Though numerically in the minority in 1867, comprising only about six million out of fifteen million, they were a strong race, accustomed to rule and determined to rule. The majority of the population, on the other hand, was split up into several races, consisted mostly of peasants, and had no political training, and no able leadership. Only in Croatia was there a Slavic people, with separate institutions and a strong individuality. The Magyars recognized this fact, having learned a useful lesson from the failure of 1849, and concluded with Croatia in 1868 a compromise very similar to the one they had themselves concluded with Austria in the year preceding. In regard to all the other races, the dominant people resolved to Magyarize them early and thoroughly, a policy it has since steadily persisted in. The Magyars have insisted upon the use of the Magyar tongue in public offices, courts, schools, and in the railway service—wherever, in fact, it has been possible. They have refused to make any concessions to the various peoples, and have, indeed, tried to stamp out their peculiarities. Besides pursuing this policy of vigorous amalgamation, they have developed the country economically. The Government has taken over the great railways, has made them productive, and has used them to further this process of Magyarization by encouraging the country people to come into the cities, where the Magyar influence is strongest. They have steadily supported the Compromise of 1867, by which they have greatly profited. They have reduced the authority of ecclesiastics in the state by establishing civil marriage, and the registration of births, deaths, and marriages by state authorities, rather than by the clergy.

The Magyars.

The Croatians.

The policy of Magyarization.

But Hungary has not yet been Magyarized. Race questions are still important. The Croatians wish larger independence than they now have. There are powerful parties among the Roumanians in Transylvania, which desire separation from Hungary and incorporation in the Kingdom of

Race questions.

Roumania to the east. And many of the Slavs in the south desire annexation to the Kingdom of Servia.

Moreover, in recent years a party has arisen among the Magyars themselves, under the leadership of Francis Kossuth, son of Louis Kossuth of 1848, which is opposed to the Compromise of 1867, and wishes to have Hungary more independent than she is. This party demands that Hungary shall have her own diplomatic corps, shall control her relations with foreign countries independently of Austria, and shall possess the right to have her own tariff. Particularly does it demand the use of Magyar in the Hungarian part of the army of the dual monarchy—a demand pressed passionately, but resisted thus far with unshakable firmness by the Emperor, Francis Joseph, who considers that the safety of the state is dependent upon having one language in use in the army, that there may not be confusion and disaster on the battlefield. Scenes of great violence have occurred over this question, both in Parliament and outside of it, but the Emperor has not yielded. Government was brought to a deadlock, and, indeed, for several years the Ausgleich could not be renewed, save by the arbitrary act of the Emperor, for a year at a time. Francis Joseph finally threatened, if forced to concede the recognition of the Hungarian language, to couple with it the introduction of universal suffrage into Hungary, for which there is a growing popular demand. This the Magyars do not wish, fearing that it will rob them of their dominant position by giving a powerful weapon to the politically inferior but more numerous races, and that they will, therefore, ultimately be submerged by the Slavs about them. Less than twenty-five per cent. of the adult male population of Hungary at present possess the vote.

Struggle over the question of language.

Territorial gains and losses.

The House of Hapsburg has lost since 1815 the rich Lombardo-Venetian kingdom (1859-66). It has gained, however, Bosnia and Herzegovina. As a result of the Russo-Turkish war of 1877 these Turkish provinces were handed

over by the Congress of Berlin of 1878 to Austria-Hungary to "occupy" and "administer." The Magyars opposed the assumption of these provinces, wishing no more Slavs in the monarchy, but despite their opposition they were taken over, so strongly was the Emperor in favor of it. This acquisition of these Balkan countries renders Austria-Hungary a more important factor in all Balkan politics, and in the discussions concerning the so-called Eastern Question, namely, the future of European Turkey. In October 1908 Austria-Hungary declared them formally annexed.

CHAPTER XVIII

ENGLAND TO THE REFORM BILL OF 1832

England in 1815.

Great Britain appeared in 1815, to the superficial observer, in a brilliant light. She had persisted, when others had faltered, in her bitter hostility to Napoleon. She had been the soul of the coalitions, and the crowning victory of Waterloo seemed to place her at the very head of the nations of Europe. Her energy and her wealth seemed to be unbounded. Her population had been only 14,000,000 at the beginning of the great war; at the end it was 19,000,000. Her debt, it is true, had increased with appalling rapidity. Over a billion dollars in 1792, it was over four billion in 1815.[1] The annual interest charge amounted to over 150,000,000 dollars. Her expenditures during those years exceeded seven billion dollars. But while her debt and the yearly expenditures grew at an unprecedented rate, the wealth of the country grew more rapidly, and the burden of the state was more easily borne than ever. For the period had been one of extraordinary material development. The growth of her industry at home and her commerce abroad had made her easily the first industrial and the first commercial power in the world. This industrial and commercial supremacy, fully revealed during the Napoleonic wars and the period just succeeding, rested upon a series of remarkable inventions and discoveries made by Englishmen in the latter part of the eighteenth century, inventions so momentous, so far reaching in their results, that they effected what has been justly called the Industrial Revolution. This transformation and development of in-

The Industrial Revolution.

[1] Debt in 1792, £239,650,000; in 1815, £861,000,000.

dustry has brought with it a complete change in the material conditions of life. The change is most striking in the domain of manufacture. Previously nearly everything was made by hand. Now a succession of English inventors—Hargreaves, Arkwright, Crompton, Cartwright—invented machines which completely altered the methods of production in the two basic industries of England, the manufacture of cotton and woolen goods. These machines could produce more in a given time than many hand laborers could do. The machine was substituted for the hand of man, as the chief feature in production. But there was a limit to which, under existing conditions, machine industry could be developed. That limit was determined by the amount of motive force available for running the machines, usually too large and heavy to be operated by hand. The only motive force then used, in addition to that of men and animals, was that of the wind and falling water, exploited by windmills and water-wheels. But such force was precarious, and not easily controlled. The wind might be too high, or there might be no wind. The river might do damage by floods, or might run dry. Industry needed a new motive force, limitless in quantity and capable of regulation. This it found in steam. For a long time the expansive power of steam had attracted attention, and there had been some speculation during the last hundred years as to the possibility of using it. A blacksmith, Newcomen, had made a tolerable steam engine in 1705, which could be used in pumping water, and was so used in many mines during the century. But it was James Watt, a mathematical instrument maker, who constructed the first efficient and economical steam engine. Applying for his first patents in 1769, he continued to study the problem and improve the engine until his death in 1819. From about 1781 steam engines began to be used in manufacturing, especially in cotton and woolen factories. The invention of Watt had supplied the world with a new motive force of incalculable effectiveness.

A new motive force.

The steam engine.

The industrial primacy of Great Britain.

These inventions and processes were for a while monopolized by Great Britain, for it was not until after the downfall of Napoleon that they came into general use on the Continent. Manufacturing on a large scale, she was able to outstrip all possible rivals. She first developed the so-called factory system, and first utilized its advantages. These inventors, says an historian of modern England, "did more for the cause of mankind than even Wellington. Their lives had more influence on their country's future than the career of the great general. His victories secured his country peace for rather more than a generation. Their inventions gave Great Britain a commercial supremacy which neither war nor foreign competition has yet destroyed." [1] "It is our improved steam engine," wrote Francis Jeffrey in the *Edinburgh Review* in 1819, "that has fought the battles of Europe, and exalted and sustained, through the late tremendous contest, the political greatness of our land. It is the same great power which enables us now to pay the interest of our debt, and to maintain the arduous struggle in which we are still engaged with the skill and capital of countries less oppressed with taxation." [2]

Advantages derived from the Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars.

But England profited not only from the genius of her inventors. The long war itself had greatly contributed to her commercial expansion. England had not been invaded; her industries had not been injured, their activity interrupted or rendered precarious, as had been the case in all the countries of the Continent. She prospered both because she was unmolested and because they were molested, so that they were forced to rely upon her for many things which in normal times they would have manufactured for themselves. The war, too, had given her the command of the seas. The carrying trade of the world was almost entirely hers.

[1] Walpole's History of England since 1815, I, 66; on the whole subject of this series of inventions and the expansion of industry see Walpole, I, 44-67.

[2] Quoted by Cheyney, Readings in English History, 614-615.

The material development of England filled other nations with envy. Her empire also was commanding in its range and universality. As one after another of the countries of Europe became the enemy of Britain, she attacked its colonies. Thus at the close of the long war she had enriched herself with valuable possessions, hitherto belonging to France and Holland.[1]

The renown of Parliament.

The proud position that England held was ascribed, in the general opinion of Europe, to the excellence of her government. This government enjoyed a great reputation on the Continent. It had remained erect throughout a period when other governments, one after another, had collapsed. It had followed a uniform, persistent policy from the beginning to the end, with a single slight interruption, while the policy of other nations had veered and changed, and changed and veered again. It seemed that there must be some peculiar merit in a system that remained immutable in a world of change. Europeans heard of England as a land of freedom, of representative government, of local self-government. The renown of her Parliament had filled the world. It was known that her Parliament was her real ruler, that though the king reigned he did not govern, that the real executive was the ministry of the hour, that ministries rose and fell according to the will of Parliament. The fact that England was so successful under this parliamentary and cabinet system of government, which was supposed to be the mouthpiece of the English people, gave great impetus to the demand for similar institutions on the Continent. England was the model to which Liberals and reformers everywhere were prone to point.

England a land of the Old Regime.

Yet on examination it was seen that this structure was far from fair, that it was honeycombed with abuses, marked by glaring discriminations between social classes, that England was a land of privilege, a land of the old régime, that

[1] On general material condition of Great Britain in 1815, Walpole, I, 22-113.

her institutions required radical change to bring them into proper adjustment with the new age and its ideas. While the French across the Channel had, by supreme and violent exertions, asserted that the modern state must rest upon the principle of equality, and had, in order to give that principle definite lodgment in the facts of the national life, reduced the aristocracy and humbled the church, in England the ruling class maintained its position unshaken. England remained a land of the old régime until 1832, forty years after the great transformation in France.

Commanding position of the nobility.

Power rested with the aristocracy, composed of the nobility and the gentry. This class largely controlled local government and local taxation. The "local self-government" of England, so much praised and idealized abroad, as if it were government of the people by the people, did not exist. In the counties the country nobility filled the most important offices in the local governing boards and in the militia. Smaller offices were occupied by its dependents. In the boroughs, too, its influence was generally decisive with the close corporations which controlled most of them. Its power was glaringly apparent at the top, in Parliament. The House of Lords was composed almost exclusively of large landed proprietors. This was the inexpugnable bulwark of the prevailing social class. But the House of Commons was also another stronghold hardly less secure. This body, supposed, as its name shows, to be representative of the commoners of England, conspicuously belied its name. Its composition was so extraordinary that it merits full description, particularly as the great reform movement of the next generation concerned it primarily, its thorough alteration being correctly felt to be the condition absolutely precedent to all other reforms.

The House of Commons.

The system of representation.

The House of Commons in 1815 consisted of 658 members; 489 of these were returned by England, 100 by Ireland, 45 by Scotland, 24 by Wales. There were three kinds of constituencies—the counties, the boroughs, and the

universities. In England each county had two members, and nearly all of the boroughs had two each, though a few had but one. Representation had no relation to the size of the population in either case. A large county and a small county, a large borough and a small borough, had the same number of members. In times past the king had possessed the right to summon this town and that to send up two burgesses to London. Once given that right it usually retained it. If a new town should grow up, the monarch might give it the right, but he was not obliged to. Since 1625 only two new boroughs had been created. Thus the constitution of the House of Commons had become stereotyped at a time when population was increasing and was also shifting greatly from old centers to new. An increasing inequality in the representation was a feature of the political system. Thus the county and borough representation of the ten southern counties of England was 237, and of the thirty others only 252; yet the latter had a population nearly three times as large as the former. All Scotland returned only 45 members, while the single English county of Cornwall (including its boroughs, of course) returned 44. Yet the population of Scotland was eight times as large as that of Cornwall.[1]

The county suffrage.

The suffrage in the counties was uniform, and was enjoyed by those who possessed land yielding them an income of forty shillings a year. But as this worked out it gave a very restricted suffrage, for England was the land of large estates, and the tendency toward the absorption of small estates in large ones was steadily increasing. The small farmer, holding his land in his own right, who was so common in France, had become almost universally in England a mere tenant of a large landholder. Accurate statistics are lack-

[1] These numbers include not only the county representatives proper but also the representatives of the boroughs located in the respective counties.

ing, but Gneist estimates that at least four-fifths of the cultivable land of the United Kingdom belonged to not more than 7,000 of the nobility and gentry. The county voters, then, were chiefly the men who had large country estates, and not the farmers and peasantry who tilled them. The county representation was consequently a stronghold of the aristocracy. Counties in which there were so few voters could often be easily controlled by the wealthy landowners. Indeed, in many counties the election of the landowners' nominee was accepted as so much a matter of course that there were no opposing candidates. In at least three counties there had been no contest for over a hundred years.

Scotland. In Scotch counties the condition was even worse. There the suffrage was not determined by ownership of land, but by the possession of a so-called "superiority," or direct grant from the crown, producing at least 400 pounds a year. The result was that there were not three thousand county voters in all Scotland; yet the population of Scotland was nearly two million. Fife had 240 voters, Cromarty 9. In the county of Roxburgh in 1831 the result of the election was a "great majority" of 40 to 19. Yet that county had a population of more than 40,000. The climax was reached in Bute, where there were 21 voters out of a population of 14,000, only one of whom lived in the county. On a certain occasion only one voter attended the election meeting of that county. He constituted himself chairman, nominated himself, called the list of voters, and declared himself returned to Parliament.

The suffrage in boroughs. Such was the situation in the counties of Great Britain, which returned 186 members to the House of Commons. But more important were the boroughs, which returned 467 members.[1] In the counties the suffrage was uniform; in the boroughs, on the other hand, there was a bewildering variety in the methods whereby the right to vote was secured. In the boroughs, too, the influence of the landowning

[1] The universities returned 5 members.

and wealthy class was even greater and more decisive than in the counties. The boroughs were of several kinds or types—nomination boroughs, rotten or close boroughs, boroughs in which there was a considerable body of voters, boroughs in which the suffrage was almost democratic. It was the existence of the first two classes that contributed the most to the popular demand for the reform of the House. In the nomination boroughs, the right to choose the two burgesses was completely in the hands of the patron. Such places might have lost all their inhabitants, yet representation, being an attribute of geographical areas rather than of population, these places were still entitled to their two members. Thus Corfe Castle was a ruin, Old Sarum a green mound, Gatton was part of a park, while Dunwich had long been submerged beneath the sea, yet these places, entirely without inhabitants, still had two members each in the House, because it had been so decided centuries before, when they did have a population, and because the English Parliament took no account of changes. Thus the owner of the ruined wall, or the green mound, or this particular portion of the bottom of the sea, had the right of nomination.

Nomination boroughs.

In the rotten or close boroughs the members were elected by the corporation, that is, by the mayor and aldermen, or the suffrage was in the hands of voters, who, however, were so few, from a dozen to fifty in many cases,[1] and generally so poor that the patron could easily influence them by bribery or intimidation to choose his candidates. Elections in such cases were a mere matter of form. Walpole states that in 1793 245 members were notoriously returned by the influence of 128 peers. Thus peers, themselves sitting in the House of Lords, had representatives sitting in the other House. Lord Lonsdale thus returned nine members, and was known as "premier's cat-o'-nine-tails." Others returned six, five, four apiece. Some would

Rotten boroughs.

[1] Ninety members represented places of less than 50 voters each.

sell their appointments to the highest bidder, and a common price was 10,000 pounds for two seats for a single parliament. Borough-mongering was common.[1] It was stated in 1817 that seats were bought and sold like tickets to the opera. Thus at the period at which this history opens a considerable majority of the members of the House of Commons was returned through the influence of a small body of patrons. These were noblemen, or wealthy landowners, who aspired to become noblemen and chose this method of acquiring political power, that thus they might in the end be raised to the peerage.

In the third class of boroughs, those with a fairly large electorate, there was much bribery, while the fourth class of practically democratic boroughs was very small. On the other hand, there were large industrial cities with no representation at all, such as Manchester, with a population of 140,000, Birmingham with 100,000, Leeds with 75,000, Sheffield with about 70,000.[2]

Unrepresented cities.

Bribery, as has been said, was customary. The polls were kept open for fifteen days. Where there were contests the expenses were borne by the candidates. These were sometimes enormous. A case is on record in which the two candidates spent 200,000 pounds in a single election. Rich men were willing to make these vast expenditures. For once in Parliament they were on the road to political power and social eminence. They or their sons might enter the peerage,

Bribery.

[1] Some of the most honorable and useful members bought their seats as the only way of getting into Parliament on an independent basis, though they utterly detested the system. See the case of Romilly. Cheyney, Readings in English History, pp. 644-646.

[2] The salient fact about the suffrage in boroughs before 1832 is that it varied greatly from place to place. Molesworth considers the following a tolerably complete list of these qualifications: "House-holders, resident house-holders, house-holders paying scot and lot: inhabitants, resident inhabitants, inhabitants paying scot and lot: burgesses, capital burgesses, burgage-holders; freeholders, freemen, resident freemen; corporations, potwallopers, payers of poor rates." Molesworth, History of England, I, 66 note.

and numerous sinecures might fall in the direction of the family. For this reason men who were making their fortunes in industry sought to enter the class of landed proprietors by purchasing large estates. Thus the established order gained additional support in the ambition of the newly arising moneyed class. Well might the younger Pitt exclaim: "This House is not the representation of the people of Great Britain; it is the representation of nominal boroughs, of ruined and exterminated towns, of noble families, of wealthy individuals, of foreign potentates." The government of England was not representative, but was oligarchical.

The Established Church.

Closely identified with the State, and, like the State, thoroughly permeated with the principle of special privileges, was another body, the Church of England. Though there was absolute religious liberty in Great Britain, though men might worship as they saw fit, the position of the Anglican Church was one greatly favored. Only members of that church possessed any real political power. No Catholic could be a member of Parliament, or hold any office in the state or municipality. In theory Protestants who dissented from the Anglican Church were likewise excluded from holding office. In practice, however, they were enabled to, by the device of the so-called Act of Indemnity, an act passed each year by Parliament, pardoning them for having held the positions illegally during the year just past. The position of the Dissenter was both burdensome and humiliating. He had to pay taxes for the support of the Church of England, though he did not belong to it. He had to register his place of worship with authorities of the Church of England. He could only be married by a clergyman of that church, unless he were a Quaker or a Jew. There was no such thing as civil marriage, or marriage by dissenting clergymen. A Roman Catholic or a Dissenter could not graduate from Cambridge, could not even enter Oxford, owing to the religious tests exacted, which only Anglicans could meet. The natural result of the supremacy

Dissenters.

of this religion was that those embraced it who were influenced by self-interest, who were ambitious for political preferment, for social advancement, or for an Oxford or Cambridge education for their sons. It was "ungentlemanlike" to be a Dissenter.

Abuses within the Church.

Not only was the Church of England privileged with reference to other churches, but within the Church itself there were great inequalities. Bishops and archbishops received large salaries, ranging from ten to one hundred and fifty thousand dollars a year. These prizes went to the younger sons or protégés of the great families. The assumption was, as Sir Leslie Stephen says, that "a man of rank who takes orders should be rewarded for his condescension." On the other hand, there were thousands of parish clergymen with wretchedly low salaries. The latter had little chance of promotion. There were pluralities and absenteeism in this Church, exactly as in the Roman Catholic Church in pre-revolutionary France. The clergy were eminently respectable, but eminently worldly, a social, if not a spiritual, force in the life of England, an interested bulwark of the established order.

The great institutions of England, therefore, were controlled by the rich, and in the interest of the rich. Legislation favored the powerful, the landed nobility, and the rich class of manufacturers that was growing up, whose interests were similar. The immense mass of the people received scant consideration. Their education was woefully neglected. Probably three-fourths of the children of England did not receive the slightest instruction. Laborers were forbidden to combine to improve their conditions, which the state itself never dreamed of improving. Even their food was made artificially dear by tariffs on breadstuffs passed in the interests of the landlords. The reverse side of the picture of English greatness and power and prosperity was gloomy in the extreme. England was in need of sweeping and numerous reforms to meet the demands of modern

The people neglected.

liberalism, whether in politics, in economics, or in social institutions.

The conditions just described had not escaped challenge. In the last quarter of the eighteenth century, two writers in particular, of great vigor and originality, Adam Smith and Jeremy Bentham, had subjected English institutions and policies to trenchant and damaging criticism. Adam Smith had published in 1776 his "Wealth of Nations," a comprehensive condemnation of the prevalent economic theories and practices of Great Britain. He denounced protection and defended free trade, and urged liberty in the economic life in place of constant and minute governmental regulation. Bentham criticized government and jurisprudence and morals. Aroused by Blackstone's panegyric of the British Constitution as the perfection of human wisdom, he published in 1776 a "Fragment on Government," in which he showed unsparingly its defects. He laid down in this, and in other books in later years, the principle that "the greatest happiness of the greatest number is the foundation of morals and legislation"; that "the end of all government is utility, or the good of the governed." Obviously, English government was not based on any such principle. Bentham applied his principle of utility to all the institutions of England in succession—the monarchy, the church, the courts, parliament—showing how harmful rather than useful each was. He was constructive also, showing how the grievous defects could be remedied.

Adam Smith.

Jeremy Bentham.

The views of Smith and Bentham made no impression upon Parliament, but they gradually influenced the rising generation. They contributed greatly to the reforms effected from about 1825 to 1850. They would probably have been effective much earlier had it not been for the French Revolution, which, working much good for France, worked nothing but evil for England. English conservatism became stiff and implacable. Liberal demands must be

Effect of the French Revolution upon England.

resisted, because, as any one could see, they led to anarchy and violence and a Reign of Terror. From 1793 to 1815 the liberal reformers of England were silenced by the odium attached to the deeds of their French neighbors. Salutary changes were delayed for a whole generation. The Tory party, opposed to all change, was assured of a long lease of power, one that lasted, indeed, until 1830.

Economic distress after 1815.

The demand for reform was resumed, however, after the final victory over Napoleon at Waterloo, and became more and more emphatic. It drew its main strength from the deep and widespread wretchedness of the people. Contrary to all expectations, the peace did not bring with it happiness and prosperity, but rather intense suffering and the hatred of class and class. The reasons for this are not far to seek. As long as war continued England was the manufacturer and the common carrier of the world. Now that the war was over this practical monopoly was destroyed, the foreign market was restricted by the renewed activity of European manufacturers and merchants, who could now conduct their business in security. The export trade fell off rapidly. Then the English Government reduced its expenditures suddenly by one-half, greatly injuring all those industries which had furnished it the materials of war. Thus manufacturers, losing customers at home and abroad, were forced, some into bankruptcy, others to curtail their activity, in other words, to dismiss thousands of workmen. And at this very moment, when laborers were being thrown out of employment or were finding their wages reduced, their number was being increased by the disbandment of the militia and the reduction in the army and navy. The navy alone was reduced from 100,000 men in 1815 to 33,000 in 1816. At the time when the number of laborers was greater than the demand, 200,000 or more men were added to the labor market. Furthermore, the next few years saw a series of bad harvests. By these, and by the Corn Law of 1815, bread was made dearer.

Lack of employment.

Add also the fact that the modern industrial or factory system was painfully supplanting the old system of household industries and temporarily throwing multitudes out of employment, or employing them under hard, even inhuman conditions, and it is not difficult to understand the widespread, desperate discontent of the mass of the population. A Parliament, organ of the rich minority, refused to help them; it even forbade them to help themselves, for it was a misdemeanor for workmen to combine. If they did, they would be sent to jail. Labor was unorganized.

The demand for reform.

The prevalence of such conditions naturally furthered the demand for reforms, long held in check by the war. Now that the war was over, the time seemed to have come for legislation remedial of the many abuses in English institutions, and of the existing economic distress. But the ministry and Parliament saw only danger in change, and set themselves grimly against all concessions. The years from 1815 to 1820 are years of repression and alarm, as pronounced in England as in most of the countries of Europe.

William Cobbett.

The demand for reforms came primarily from the poor and disheartened masses, who possessed a remarkable leader in the person of William Cobbett, the son of an agricultural laborer. For some years Cobbett had published a liberal periodical called "The Weekly Political Register," in which he had opposed the Government. In 1816 he reduced the price of his paper from a shilling to twopence, made his appeal directly to the laboring class, and became their guide and spokesman. The effect was instantaneous. For the first time the lower class had an organ, cheap, moreover brilliantly written, for Cobbett's literary ability was such that a London paper, the *Standard*, declared that for clearness, force, and power of copious illustration he was unrivaled since the time of Swift. Cobbett was the first great popular editor, who for nearly thirty years, with but little interruption, expressed in his weekly paper the wishes and the emotions of the laboring

classes. He was a great democratic leader, a powerful popular editor, a pugnacious and venomous opponent of the existing régime, a champion of the cause of parliamentary reform.

Parliamentary reform.

For Cobbett persuaded the working people that they must first get the right to vote before they could get social and economic reforms. Parliamentary reform must have precedence. Let the people get political power, let them change Parliament from the organ of a narrow class into a truly national assembly, and then they could abolish the evils from which they suffered, and put useful statutes into force. He demanded, therefore, universal suffrage. Other leaders appeared also, and a considerable fermentation of ideas among the unpropertied and working classes characterized these years.

Certain radicals took more active measures which aroused disproportionate alarm in the minds of the ministry, who scented a new French Revolution in every popular commotion, and were ready to go to almost any length to stamp out the troublesome spirit. The distress of the masses led

Popular disturbances.

to disturbances. Riots broke out in 1816. Farm buildings, barns, stacks, business premises were set on fire. Machines were broken by workmen who thought them the cause of their woes. Obnoxious tradesmen were attacked. The ministry, thinking it necessary in the interests of property to make an example, arrested seventy-three of the wretched rioters of Ely, secured the condemnation to death of thirty-four of them, and the actual execution of five. Such was the reply of the British Government to the prevalent discontent. Similar disturbances occurred elsewhere, and were similarly suppressed. A political demonstration of a radical character was held in Spa Fields in London in the same year (1816). The Government prosecuted the leaders for treason, but the jury declined to convict. Somewhat later when the Prince Regent was returning from Parliament, where he had declared that the English electoral system

was the most perfect the world had ever seen, the people threw stones at his carriage, breaking one of its windows.

Suspension of Habeas Corpus.

The legislation occasioned by these occurrences was harshly repressive. No less grave a measure was passed than one suspending the Habeas Corpus Act, an act which no Parliament in Great Britain, since that of 1817, has felt it necessary to suspend. An act for the suppression of seditious meetings was hardly more defensible. It was the object of this bill to prevent political discussion by the public. Only with the special permission of a magistrate could a debating club meet or a lecture be given or a reading room be opened. The ministry even declined to make any exception of lectures on medicine, surgery, and chemistry. Such legislation only the gravest necessity could justify, and such necessity did not exist. That it could be used to damage political opponents of the existing ministry was soon made evident. The suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act drove Cobbett, the most aggressive opponent of the ministry, into temporary exile.

The Massacre of Peterloo.

Two years later a more important event occurred in Manchester. A public meeting was held in St. Peters Field, August 16, 1819, for the purpose of petitioning for parliamentary reform and the redress of grievances. This meeting had been declared illegal by the authorities, yet the organizers had determined to hold it nevertheless. Fifty thousand men, women, and children came together accordingly to listen to Hunt, a popular orator. The police attempted to arrest Hunt and the other leaders. The crowd closed in around them, jeering. The magistrates apparently lost their heads. They ordered a body of cavalry and yeomanry to rescue the police. The result, however, was that the troops charged the crowd which was unarmed. There was a scene of fearful confusion; several defenseless people were killed at once; many more were injured. This so-called Massacre of Peterloo angered the people, and in the end furthered the agitation for reform, but the Government warmly approved the

action of the magistrates and induced Parliament to pass the famous Six Acts or Gag Laws which represent the climax of this sorry reaction in England, and which stringently restricted the freedom of speech, of the press, and of public meeting, which had long been the boast of England.

The Six Acts.

Such was the answer of the Tory aristocracy under Lord Liverpool to the demands of the discontented and distressed. No attempt on the part of the privileged classes to examine the grievances of the people, to seek to remove the causes of the universal discontent, but only harsh and repressive legislation that encroached gravely upon the traditional liberties of the British people. The conquerors of Napoleon were easily frightened. Their policy of coercion was successful. The radical party was silenced. It reappeared ten years later, however, and contributed immensely to the cause of parliamentary reform which then became irresistible.

Death of George III.

In 1820 George III died at the age of eighty-one. He had for many years been insane, and the regency had been exercised by his son, who now became George IV, and who reigned from 1820 to 1830.

The dawn of an era of reform.

After 1820 a change gradually came over the political life of England. The Tory party still retained its great majority in Parliament, but it showed a tendency toward liberalism. With returning prosperity after the resumption of specie payments in 1819, the disturbances of the last few years ceased, and the panic, into which the governing classes had been thrown by the French Revolution, passed away. Several of the more reactionary members of the ministry died or resigned, and their places were taken by men of a younger and more liberal generation. Canning, Peel, and Huskisson made the Tory party an engine of partial reform. Under Canning, as Foreign Secretary from 1822, England assumed the position that each nation is free to determine its own form of government, a doctrine opposed to that of the Holy Alliance of the right of inter-

Defiance of the Holy Alliance.

vention in the affairs of other states whose acts might be thought to imperil the principle of monarchy. Canning freed England from all connection with the Holy Alliance. He recognized the independence of the Spanish colonies in America. If Spain could reconquer them she might. But no foreign country, declared Canning, should subdue them for her. "I called the New World in," he said, "to redress the balance of the Old." The main significance of Canning's administration of the Foreign Office is that at least one of the great powers with boldness and success defied the smug and timorous reactionary policy of the absolute monarchies of the Continent. Similar interventions in Portuguese and Greek affairs served the cause of liberalism in those countries.

Economic reforms.

While Canning was making England's foreign policy more liberal, Huskisson was introducing greater liberty into commerce by carrying bills in 1823 altering the Navigation Laws, which threw restrictions about the carrying trade, and by reducing the duties on many articles of import. This was not free trade, but it was a step in that direction. The more strongly protected interests maintained their ground for a generation longer. When Huskisson began his reforms about 1,500 Acts of Parliament regulated the administration of the tariff system; the number was now reduced to eleven, thus greatly simplifying that department.

The Penal Code.

Another important reform of these years was that of the Penal Code. The code then prevailing was a disgrace to England, and placed her far behind France and other countries. There was a crying need for reform. The punishment of death could be legally inflicted for about two hundred offenses—for picking a man's pocket, for stealing five shillings from a store, or forty shillings from a dwelling house, for stealing a fish, for injuring Westminster Bridge, for sending threatening letters, for making a false entry in a marriage register.[1]

[1] Walpole, II, 140-1, footnote, gives a partial list of these offenses.

This code, as a matter of fact, was not enforced. It was shown, for instance, that in the twelve years, from 1805 to 1817, 655 persons had been indicted for stealing five shillings from a shop. Of these 113 had been sentenced to death, but the sentence had not been carried into effect in a single instance. While this was an evidence that the humane feeling of the age condemned the law and would not enforce it, still the code, by its very harshness, tended to encourage indifference to law. Two great reformers, Romilly and Mackintosh, had labored for fifteen years to persuade Parliament to alter this barbarous code, but with only disheartening results. But now Sir Robert Peel took up the reform, and proposed and carried, in 1823, the abolition of the death penalty in about a hundred cases. The Tory party now accepted proposals it had previously fiercely combatted. It is a curious fact that even before this more humane policy was adopted with reference to the misdeeds and weaknesses of men, a law for the prevention of cruelty to animals, the first of its kind, had been passed (1822).

Reformed by Sir Robert Peel.

Religious inequality.

Another reform of these years no less significant lay in the direction of greater religious liberty. In 1815 there was in England religious freedom but not religious equality. People might worship as they saw fit. Nevertheless, as we have seen, men paid a penalty for belonging to any other than the established Church of England. Political privileges were conditioned upon creed. It has been only by a series of acts passed in the nineteenth century that England has thrown open her political life to all, irrespective of church connections or religious beliefs or professions. The first step taken was the removal of the disabilities from which Protestant Dissenters suffered. These were imposed by the so-called Test and Corporation Acts. These acts, put upon the statute book at a time when there was grave fear of a violent assault upon Protestantism, had been intended to destroy the political power of the Catholics. As a qualification for holding most offices, municipal and national, the

The religious disabilities of Dissenters.

sacrament must be received according to the rites of the Anglican Church, and the oaths of supremacy and allegiance taken. The Test Act required a declaration against transubstantiation. Though these acts were designed to exclude Catholics, they went further and excluded as well Dissenters generally. Yet with singular inconsistency Dissenters were permitted to be members of Parliament, and thus to participate in the making of the laws of England. For a long time, however, they did not vigorously object to the injustice and inconvenience which they suffered, inasmuch as they hated and feared Catholics more than they coveted political power, and believed that the repeal of the Test Act would inevitably lead to the emancipation of the Catholics, which they did not wish to see. Moreover, as has been already stated, a convenient device was made to fit their case. They were, as a matter of practice, permitted to hold office, though in so doing they were lawbreakers. Then Parliament would pass an act of indemnity pardoning them for what they had done. This had for a long while been the established custom; consequently the Test Act no longer operated to the exclusion of Dissenters from office, but was only a badge of religious inferiority. In 1828 the Test and Corporation Acts were repealed as being no longer in harmony with the age or with the wishes of Dissenters. Henceforth every person on entering upon office must make a declaration "on the true faith of a Christian" that he would not use his authority in any way against the Established Church. These words had the effect of excluding Jews from office, thereby occasioning in the years to come a new agitation and a new reform.

Repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts.

Thus the monopoly of the Church had in one particular been broken. The repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts was an act of complete justice to Protestant Nonconformists, but of only partial justice to Roman Catholics. Though the latter could now hold most offices they were still excluded from Parliament, for their exclusion from Parliament depended not on the Test Act but upon an act passed in

Catholic disabilities.

1679, and which was still in force, requiring all members of Parliament to take the oath of supremacy and to make a declaration against transubstantiation and the adoration of the Virgin Mary. Thus, while after the repeal of the Test Act in 1828, Catholics might be appointed to municipal and national offices, they might not sit in either House of Parliament. They were not upon an equality with Protestants in political matters, and had no share in the legislation of the empire. Moreover, their position was anomalous and contradictory. In Ireland all forty shilling freeholders possessed the suffrage. Thus a large number of Catholics could vote for members of the House of Commons, but practically they could only vote for Protestants, as Protestants alone would subscribe to the oath and declaration required of all members. Nevertheless it was not illegal for Catholics to vote for one of their own faith and elect him. They would, of course, be throwing away their suffrage as such a person would certainly, for the reason given, not be permitted to take his seat.

Catholic Emancipation.

Catholic Emancipation, as the removal of these disabilities was called, had for forty years been a prominent question in English politics. Some of the great statesmen of England had tried to solve it favorably to Catholic claims, notably Pitt and Canning, but without success, owing to the prevalent bigotry. George III and George IV were violently opposed, George III declaring that he should reckon any man his personal enemy who should propose any measure of relief, and they were supported by the more conservative Tories. The question entered upon the acute stage in 1828. The Duke of Wellington was prime minister and Sir Robert Peel was the most important member of the cabinet. Both were opposed on principle to Catholic emancipation. The ministry wished to postpone all discussion of the question. But events were just then occurring in Ireland which would have rendered further postponement of the settlement an act of sheer madness. An agitation,

widesweeping and portentous, convulsed this long suffering people. A man of remarkable powers of leadership had arisen and had forced the crisis. Daniel O'Connell is one of the most extraordinary men in Irish history. A thrilling orator and a shrewd and energetic lawyer he could inflame vast multitudes of men, yet could lead them safely past snares and pitfalls. Believing that Ireland could only obtain justice by an overwhelming display of force he founded the Catholic Association to advocate Catholic claims. This soon became so powerful a political body as to alarm the Government. A law was accordingly passed in 1825 ordering its dissolution. The law was from the start a dead letter. The Association, dissolved, immediately reappeared in another form. Monster meetings were held, where the witchery of O'Connell's oratory was displayed and his marvelous power of control of an excitable and injured people conspicuously manifested. These monster demonstrations were marked by no excesses. They constituted an indignant and resolute protest against unfair legislation. O'Connell now decided upon an act so bold that he believed it would mean the end of the agitation. A vacancy occurred in the parliamentary representation from the county of Clare. O'Connell decided to be a candidate. He was triumphantly elected. He was a Catholic, therefore debarred by the laws from membership. The electors voted for him despite the fact that they were throwing their votes away. They aimed to produce a moral effect and they succeeded. It was evident that O'Connell could be similarly returned in almost every other county in Ireland should the occasion occur, that the people were in earnest, and united. It was the fear that this was the attitude of a united people on the very brink of a revolt rather than any sense of the justice of the cause that prompted Wellington and Peel to bring in the famous Emancipation Bill, to force it through an unwilling Parliament, and to impose it upon an unwilling King. Wellington candidly admitted that he was driven to

Daniel O'Connell.

O'Connell elected to Parliament.

this step by fear of civil war. George IV felt, as he afterward said, like a person with a pistol at his breast. Like most persons in such a predicament he yielded (1829). Catholics were henceforth admitted to both Houses of Parliament, and with a few exceptions they might now fill any municipal and state office. The act established real political equality between Catholics and Protestants.

Emancipation carried.

The restriction of the suffrage in Ireland.

But at the very time that Catholics were given the right to sit in Parliament, they were in large majority deprived of the suffrage, for the property qualification for voters in Ireland was raised from forty shillings to two hundred. Thus in removing one grievance a new one was created, certainly an ineffective method of pacifying Ireland. One hundred and ninety thousand forty-shilling freeholders were disfranchised offhand. It is to be said, however, that this Tory Parliament would not have consented to Catholic Emancipation had it not known beforehand that this blow would be dealt to democracy.

Tory opposition to the reform of Parliament.

The reforms that have just been described were carried through by the Tory party. There was one reform, however, more fundamental and important, which it was clear that that party would never concede, the reform of Parliament itself. The significant features of the parliamentary system have already been described. That they required profound alteration had been held by many of the Whigs for more than fifty years. But the Whigs had been powerless to effect anything, having long been in the minority. A combination of circumstances, however, now brought about the downfall of the party so long dominant, and rendered possible the great reform. George IV died on June 26, 1830, and was succeeded by his brother William IV (1830-1837). The death of the monarch necessitated a new election of Parliament. Many of the influential Tory politicians, indignant that Wellington and Peel had consented to the emancipation of the Catholics, wished to punish their leaders by sending up members to the Commons who would be

opposed to them. Wellington's foreign policy increased the unpopularity of the ministry. Moreover, just at this time the distress of the working classes was great, and they were demanding parliamentary reform with renewed vigor. Suddenly the French Revolution of 1830 occurred. It exerted a great influence in England. To the distressed and discontented it was an encouragement to further activity. But its influence upon the well-to-do middle class was more important as it proved that great changes could be effected without bringing social anarchy in their train. Thus the specter of revolution that had haunted the imagination of the solid, conservative class of Englishmen was finally laid by a revolution both reasonably orderly and most salutary. This class was no longer unwilling to co-operate with the working people. It now took up with energy the demand for reform.

Influence of the French Revolution of 1830.

The elections of 1830, held under such circumstances, resulted in a Tory loss of fifty members in the Commons. Though that party still had a majority it was not likely to last long, as many Tories were opposed to Wellington. Parliament met in November 1830, and the question of reform was immediately introduced. The Duke of Wellington showed his position by a remarkable eulogy of the English Parliament as one which "answered all the good purposes of legislation, and this to a greater degree than any legislature had ever answered, in any country whatever," that it possessed and deservedly possessed "the full and entire confidence of the country." He would go still further and say "that if at the present moment he had imposed upon him the duty of forming a legislature for any country—and particularly for a country like this, in possession of great property of various descriptions—he did not mean to assert that he could form such a legislature as they possessed now, for the nature of man was incapable of reaching such excellence at once, but his great endeavor would be to form some description of legislature which would produce the same

The Duke of Wellington on reform.

results." Under these circumstances he would himself never bring forward any measure changing that system, but he "should always feel it his duty to resist such measures when proposed by others." [1]

Fall of the Tory ministry.

The result of this speech, which was entirely sincere but seemed the very abdication of the intellect, was to arouse such widespread indignation that the Wellington ministry was shortly swept from office, and the Whigs came in. Thus was broken the control the Tory party had exercised with one slight interruption for forty-six years.

The First Reform Bill.

Earl Grey, who for forty years had demanded parliamentary reform, now became prime minister. A ministry was formed with ease, and included many able men, Durham, Russell, Brougham, Palmerston, Stanley, Melbourne, and on March 1, 1831, a Reform Bill was introduced in the House of Commons by Lord John Russell. It aimed to effect a redistribution of seats on a more equitable plan, and the establishment of a uniform franchise for boroughs in place of the great and absurd variety of franchises then existing. The redistribution of seats was based on two principles, the withdrawal of the right of representation from small, decayed boroughs, and its bestowal upon large and wealthy towns hitherto without it.

Provisions.

Accordingly the bill proposed to deprive all boroughs having a population of less than 2,000 of their separate representation in Parliament; to deprive all boroughs of less than 4,000 inhabitants of one of their two members. It was estimated that 110 boroughs would be affected, and that 168 seats would be abolished.[2] The ministry proposed that these should be given to the counties and the great unrepre-

[1] Quoted in May, Const. Hist. of Eng., I, 331-332. Kendall, Source Book of English History, No. 129.

[2] The list read by Lord John Russell of the boroughs which it was proposed wholly or partially to disfranchise, with the number of voters and "the prevailing influence" of each, that is the landowner, who had practical control, may be found in Molesworth, Hist. of Eng., I, 70-73; also, in part, in Cheyney, Readings in English History, 686-688.

sented boroughs. The bill amazed the House by its thoroughgoing character and encouraged the reformers. Neither side had expected so sweeping a change. The introduction of the bill precipitated a remarkable parliamentary discussion, which continued with some intervals for over fifteen months, from March 1, 1831, to June 5, 1832.

Lord John Russell's speech.

Lord John Russell in his introduction of the measure, after stating that the theory of the British Constitution was no taxation without representation, and after showing that in former times Parliament had been truly representative, said that it was no longer so. "A stranger who was told that this country is unparalleled in wealth and industry, and more civilized and more enlightened than any country was before it—that it is a country that prides itself on its freedom, and that once in every seven years it elects representatives from its population to act as the guardians and preservers of that freedom—would be anxious and curious to see how that representation is formed, and how the people choose their representatives, to whose faith and guardianship they entrust their free and liberal institutions. Such a person would be very much astonished if he were taken to a ruined mound and told that that mound sent two representatives to Parliament; if he were taken to a stone wall and told that three niches in it sent two representatives to Parliament; if he were taken to a park where no houses were to be seen, and told that that park sent two representatives to Parliament. But if he were told all this, and were astonished at hearing it, he would be still more astonished if he were to see large and opulent towns, full of enterprise and industry and intelligence, containing vast magazines of every species of manufactures, and were then told that these towns sent no representatives to Parliament."

Lord John Russell estimated that the electorate would be enlarged by about a half a million additional voters by this measure, for it proposed the extension of the suffrage as well as the redistribution of seats.

Sir Robert Inglis's speech

The first man who arose to oppose the bill was the representative of the University of Oxford, Sir Robert Inglis, who represented the opinions and prejudices of the country gentlemen so vitally affected by the measure. He denied flatly that the population of a town had ever had anything to do with its representation or that representation and taxation were in any way connected in the British Constitution. "Can the noble lord show that any town or borough has been called into parliamentary existence because it was large or populous, or excluded from it because it was small? The noble lord has tried to make much of the instance of Old Sarum. In one and the same year, the 23rd Edward I, a writ was issued to both Old and New Sarum, and in neither case was it conferred on account of population or taxation. On the contrary, I believe it was given, in the first instance, to oblige some Earl of Salisbury by putting his friends into the House. And in an account of the borough it was stated that it had lately been purchased by Mr. Pitt, the possessor of the celebrated diamond of that name, who has attained an hereditary seat in the House of Commons as much as the Earl of Arundel possessed one in the House of Peers by being the owner of Arundel Castle. How then can it be said that, according to the constitution of the country noblemen are not to be represented and their interests regarded in this House. . . . It is in vain after this to talk of the purity of representation in former times. I defy the noble lord to point out at any time when the representation was better than it is at present. I say, therefore, that what is proposed is not restorative. The House and the country may judge what it is, but I will state in one word that it is *Revolution*, a revolution that will overturn all the natural influence of rank and property." Sir Robert proceeded to show that some of the greatest men in parliamentary annals had entered the House as representatives of these nomination and close boroughs, the elder Pitt, who sat indeed for this very Old Sarum, which was to be embalmed as a classic in

Representation never better.

these debates, the younger Pitt, Burke, Canning, Fox, that thus they had a chance to show their talents and were later chosen the representatives of large towns. But no such towns would ever have chosen them had they not previously had this opportunity to prove their ability. "It is only by this means that young men who are unconnected by birth or residence with large towns can ever hope to enter this House unless they are cursed—I will call it cursed—with that talent of mob oratory which is used for the purpose of influencing the lowest and most debasing passions of the people."

Hunt's speech.

Hunt, one of the radical leaders, former hero of the field of Peterloo, and now a member of the House, took part in the debate. "How is this House constituted?" he asked, "How are many honorable members elected? Look at the borough of Ilchester and the boroughs of Lancashire and Cornwall, and see what classes of men return members to this House. I will tell the House a fact which has come to my knowledge, and which bears on that particular point. In the borough of Ilchester . . . many of the voters are of the most degraded and lowest class, who can neither read nor write, and who always take care to contract debts to the amount of £35 previous to an election, because they know that those debts will be liquidated for them. Is that, then, the class of men which the House is told represents the property of the country? I am one who thinks that this House ought to be what it professes to be—the Commons House of Parliament, representing the feelings and interest of all the common people of England."

Another member, Sir C. Wetherell, denounced the proposed loss of their positions by 168 members as "corporation robbery," as a new Pride's purge, as an imitation of the illegalities of the Cromwellian period, as republican in principle, "destructive of all property, of all right, of all privilege."

Sir Robert Peel pointed out that the close boroughs not

Sir Robert Peel's criticism.

only brought out young talent that otherwise could get no opportunity to show itself, but that they furnished refuges for distinguished members, who by some caprice of fortune had lost their hold upon their constituencies—and that thus these men could continue in the service of the nation. "During 150 years the constitution in its present form has been in force; and I would ask any man who hears me to declare whether the experience of history has produced any form of government so calculated to promote the happiness and secure the rights and liberties of a free and enlightened people." Stanley, later Lord Derby, replying to the contention that the nomination boroughs opened an opportunity to very able men to enter Parliament who might not find any other way, said, "Whatever advantage might be derived from this mode of admission would be more than balanced by this disadvantage—that the class of persons thus introduced would, whatever may be their talents and acquirements, not be looked upon by the people as representatives."

Macaulay on the Bill.

Macaulay delivered a speech on the second day of the debate that made his reputation as one of the foremost orators of the House. Replying to Sir Robert Inglis he said, "My honorable friend . . . challenges us to show that the constitution was ever better than it is. Sir, we are legislators, not antiquaries. The question for us is, not whether the constitution was better formerly, but whether we can make it better now?" Shall "a hundred drunken potwallopers in one place, or the owner of a ruined hovel in another," be invested with powers "which are withheld from cities renowned to the furthest ends of the earth for the marvels of their wealth and of their industry?" "But these great cities, says my honorable friend . . . are virtually, though not directly, represented. Are not the wishes of Manchester, he asks, as much consulted as those of any town which sends members to Parliament? Now, Sir, I do not understand how a power which is salutary when exercised virtually can be noxious when exercised

directly. If the wishes of Manchester have as much weight with us as they would have under a system which should give representatives to Manchester, how can there be any danger in giving representatives to Manchester?" Referring to the utility of the close boroughs as affording careers to men of talent he said that "we must judge of the form of government by its general tendency, not by happy accidents," and that if "there were a law that the hundred tallest men in England should be members of Parliament, there would probably be some able men among those who would come into the House by virtue of this law."

Ministry defeated, Parliament dissolved.

Thus the debate went on, an unusual number of members participating. But the bill did not have long to live. The Opposition was persistent, and on April 19th the ministry was defeated on an amendment. It resolved to appeal to the people. Parliament was dissolved and a new election ordered. This election took place in the summer of 1831 amid the greatest excitement and was one of the most momentous of the century. From one end of the land to the other the cry was, "The bill, the whole bill, and nothing but the bill." There was some violence and intimidation of voters, and bribery on a large scale was practised on both sides. The question put the candidates was, "Will you support the bill or will you oppose it?" The result of the election was an overwhelming victory for the reformers.

Second Reform Bill.

On June 24, 1831, Lord John Russell introduced the second Reform Bill, which was practically the same as the first. The Opposition did not yield, but fought it inch by inch. They tried to wear out the ministry by making dilatory motions and innumerable speeches which necessarily consisted of mere repetition. In the course of two weeks Sir Robert Peel spoke forty-eight times, Croker fifty-seven times, Wetherell fifty-eight times. However, the bill was finally passed, September 22nd, by a majority of 106. It was then sent up to the House of Lords where it was quickly killed (October 8, 1831).

Defeated by the House of Lords.

It was the Lords who chiefly profited by the existing system of nomination and rotten boroughs, and they were enraged at the proposal to end it. They were determined not to lose the power it gave them.

The defeat of the bill by the Upper House caused great indignation throughout the country. Apparently the Lords were simply greedy of their privileges. Again riots broke out in London and other towns, expressive of the popular feeling. Newspapers appeared in mourning. Bells were tolled. Threats of personal violence to the Lords were made, and in certain instances carried out. Troops were called out in some places. England, it was widely felt, was verging toward a civil war.

Third Reform Bill.

Parliament was now prorogued. It reassembled December 6th, and on the 12th, Lord John Russell rose again and introduced his third Reform Bill. Again the same tiresome tactics of the Opposition. But the bill finally passed the House of Commons, March 23, 1832, by a majority of 116.

Again the bill was before the Lords, who showed the same disposition to defeat it as before. The situation seemed hopeless. Twice the Commons had passed the bill with the manifest and express approval of the people. Were they to be foiled by a chamber based on hereditary privilege? Riots, monster demonstrations, acrimonious and bitter denunciation, showed once more the temper of the people. There was only one way in which the measure could be carried. The King might create enough peers to give its supporters a majority in the House of Lords. This, however, William IV at first refused to do. The Grey ministry consequently resigned. The King appealed to the Duke of Wellington to form a ministry. The Duke tried but failed. The King then gave way, recalled Earl Grey to power and signed a paper stating, "The King grants permission to Earl Grey and to his Chancellor, Lord Brougham, to create such a number of peers as will be sufficient to insure the passing of the Reform Bill." The peers were

never created. The threat sufficed. The bill passed the Lords, June 4, 1832, about 100 of its opponents absenting themselves from the House. It was signed and became a law. **The Bill passed.**

The bill had undergone some changes during its passage. In its final form it provided that fifty-six nomination or close boroughs with a population of less than 2,000 should lose their representation entirely; that thirty-two others, with a population of less than 4,000 should lose one seat each. The seats thus obtained were redistributed as follows: twenty-two large towns were given two members each; twenty others were given one each, and the larger counties were given additional members, sixty-five in all. Scotland and Ireland were by companion bills given increased representation. One hundred and forty-three seats were thus redistributed. There was no attempt to make equal electoral districts, but only to remove more flagrant abuses. Constituencies still varied greatly in population. The total membership of the House was not altered but remained 658. **Redistribution of Seats.**

The Reform Bill also altered and widened the suffrage. Previously the county franchise had depended entirely upon the ownership of land; that is, was limited to those who owned outright land of an annual value of forty shillings, the forty-shilling freeholders. The county suffrage was now extended to include also copyholders and leaseholders, i. e., farmers and tenants of land whose tenure was for sixty years, and of the annual value of ten pounds, and to tenants-at-will holding land worth fifty pounds a year. Thus in the counties the suffrage was dependent still upon the tenure of land, but not upon outright ownership. There were, it is seen, several methods of acquiring the county franchise. **The county franchise.**

In the boroughs a far greater change was made. The previous local franchises were all abolished, the personal rights of living voters being guaranteed, and a new uniform suffrage was adopted. The right to vote was given to all ten pound householders, which meant all who owned or **The borough franchise.**

rented a house or shop or other building of an annual rental value, with the land, of ten pounds. Thus the suffrage was practically given in boroughs to the great middle class. There was henceforth a uniform suffrage in boroughs, and a varied suffrage in counties.

The law applied only to England. In the same session similar reform bills were passed for Scotland and Ireland. In order to reduce bribery, voting in each constituency was limited henceforth to two days.

Not a democratic reform.

The Reform Bill of 1832 was not a democratic measure, but it made the House of Commons a truly representative body. It admitted to the suffrage the wealthier middle class. The number of voters, particularly in the boroughs, was considerably increased; but the laborers of England had no votes, nor had the poorer middle class. The average ratio of voters to the whole population of Great Britain was about one to thirty. The measure, therefore, though regarded as final by the Whig ministry, was not so regarded by the vast majority, who were still disfranchised. No further alteration was made until 1867, but during the whole period there was a demand for extension. In 1831 and 1832 the people, by their monster meetings, riots, acts of violence, had helped greatly to pass the bill only to find when the struggle was over that others and not themselves had profited by their efforts.

The passage of the Reform Bill showed clearly the predominance in the state of the House of Commons over both King and Lords in case the House has the evident and emphatic support of the people.

CHAPTER XIX

ENGLAND BETWEEN TWO GREAT REFORMS (1832-1867)

England had entered upon a period of Whig government that was destined to be almost as prolonged as the preceding period of Tory rule. The Tories had been in power from 1784 to 1830, with but one short interval. From 1830 to 1874 the Whigs controlled the government, with the exception of short periods which amounted in all to eight years. In the elections of 1832, held under the new conditions, the Whigs were overwhelmingly victorious. The Tories returned only about 150 members. The terms Tory and Whig now gradually gave way to the terms Conservative and Liberal, which are still in use.

An Era of Whig government.

The reforming activity of the Whigs, which had achieved the notable triumph of the great change in the House of Commons, continued unabated for several years. Several measures of great importance were passed by the reformed Parliament during the next few years.

One of the first of these was the abolition of slavery in 1833. It had been long held by the British courts that slavery could not exist in the British Isles, that the instant a slave touched the soil of England he became free. Moreover, after a long agitation, England had abolished the slave trade in 1807. Henceforth it was a crime to kidnap negroes in Africa and sell them into slavery. But slavery itself existed in the West Indies, in Mauritius and in South Africa. There were about 750,000 slaves in these colonies. To free them was a far more difficult matter than to stop the African slave trade, for it was considered an interference

Slavery in the colonies.

with the rights of property, and it might ruin the prosperity of the colonies. Two causes were now working for the abolition of slavery, a growing sensitiveness to the moral iniquity of the institution and the decreasing influence of its leading supporters, the West Indian planters, owing to the fact that their trade with Great Britain had fallen off greatly since 1815. For many years an anti-slavery agitation had been in progress, ably led by Wilberforce, Buxton, and Zachary Macaulay, father of the historian, who had created the public opinion indispensably necessary to any reform.

Various acts of legislation had been passed looking toward the improvement of the position of slaves in the crown colonies, but not providing for the abolition of the institution itself. These measures were indignantly and hotly resented by the planters, who denounced the action of the English government in vituperative terms, unwise conduct, as it still further alienated public opinion in the mother country. A bill was passed in August 1833 decreeing that slavery should cease August 1, 1834. It provided for the immediate emancipation of all children of six years and under; for a period of apprenticeship for all others for seven years, during which three-fourths of their time was to belong to their former masters, one-fourth to themselves. This, is was argued, would give them the preparation necessary for a wise and intelligent use of freedom, but the provision did not work well in practice and was ultimately allowed to lapse. A gift of twenty million pounds was made to the slave owners as compensation for the loss of their property.

Abolition of slavery.

Conscience was aroused at the same time by a cruel evil right at home, the employment, under barbarous conditions, of children in the factories of England.

Child labor.

The employment of child labor in British industries was one of the results of the rise of the modern factory system. It was early seen that much of the work done by machinery

could be carried on by children, and as their labor was cheaper than that of adults they were swept into the factories in larger and larger numbers, and a monstrous evil grew up. They were, of course, the children of the poorest people. Many began this life of misery at the age of five or six, more at the age of eight or nine. Incredible as it may seem, they were often compelled to work twelve or fourteen hours a day. Half hour intervals were allowed for meals, but by a refinement of cruelty they were expected to clean the machinery at such times. Falling asleep at their work they were beaten by overseers or injured by falling against the machinery. In this inhuman régime there was no time or strength left for education or recreation or healthy development of any kind. The moral atmosphere in which the children worked was harmful in the extreme. Physically, intellectually, morally, the result could only be stunted human beings.

Previous attacks upon the system.

This shocking abuse had been attacked spasmodically and unsuccessfully for thirty years. In 1802 a law was passed limiting the number of hours to twelve a day, and providing that work should not begin before six in the morning, nor continue after nine at night. It applied, however, to but few mills. In 1816 a bill was introduced providing that no child should be employed for more than ten hours a day in any factory. The House of Lords limited this to cotton mills and extended the hours to twelve. Later it was voted that each child should have a quarter of a holiday on each Saturday. Such was the pitifully small protection guaranteed children workers by the laws of England.

The system defended.

This monstrous system was defended by political economists, manufacturers, and statesmen in the name of individual liberty, in whose name, moreover, crimes have often been committed, the liberty of the manufacturer to conduct his business without interference from outside, the liberty of the laborer to sell his labor under whatever conditions he may be disposed or, as might more properly be said,

compelled to accept. A Parliament, however, which had been so sensitive to the wrongs of negro slaves in Jamaica, could not be indifferent to the fate of English children. Thus the long efforts of many English humanitarians, Robert Owen, Thomas Sadler, Fielden, Lord Ashley, resulted in the passage of the Factory Act of 1833, which prohibited the employment in spinning and weaving factories of children under nine, made a maximum eight hour day for those from nine to thirteen, and of twelve for those from thirteen to eighteen. The bill also provided for the sanitary conditions of the factories, for a certain amount of recreation and education, and, most important, it created a system of factory inspectors whose duty it was to see that this law was enforced. This was a very modest beginning, yet it represented a great advance on the preceding policy of England. It was the first of a series of acts regulating the conditions of laborers in the interests of society as a whole, acts which have become more numerous, more minute, and more drastic from 1833 to the present day. The idea that an employer may conduct his business entirely as he likes has no standing in modern English law.

The Factory Act, 1833.

The reform spirit, which rendered the decade from 1830 to 1840 so notable, achieved another vast improvement in the radical transformation of municipal government. The local self-government of England enjoyed great fame abroad but was actually in a very sorry condition at home. Not only was the Parliament of 1830 the organ of an oligarchy, but so was the system of local government. Usurpations of power by a single class had gone on flourishingly under the Tudor and Stuart and even Hanoverian kings. The whole political structure, local as well as general, was honeycombed with notorious abuses. The municipal and the parliamentary systems were closely bound together. The unreformed boroughs were natural supports of an unreformed House of Commons. Now that Parliament had been reformed it was natural that the same party should attempt to bring

The decay of local self-government.

about the abolition of the evils of local government. In earlier centuries all the freemen of the borough had enjoyed full rights of citizenship, and local government had been popular in character. But with the lapse of time the term "freemen" had become technical and applied only to a few in each borough, and frequently to non-residents. Thus Cambridge, with a population of about 20,000, had only 118 "freemen," Portsmouth, with 46,000, only 102. Many of these were poor, paid small taxes, and were in no sense representative citizens, yet they alone possessed the right to vote in municipal elections. Thus, in Cambridge, the freemen paid only about two thousand pounds of the twenty-five thousand of the city taxes. But in many cases even the "freemen" had no political power, but only privileges of a pecuniary nature, such as a right to share in certain charitable funds and of exemption from tolls. In very numerous cases the local government was entirely in the hands of the corporation, that is, the mayor and the common council. The mayor was chosen by the council and the councilors sat for life and had the right to fill all vacancies in their body. The government in such cases was literally a close corporation. Thus, throughout all England, a very small minority had an absolute monopoly of political power in towns and cities.

The necessity for reform.

These municipal governments were notoriously corrupt. Elected for life and self-elected they had no sense of responsibility to the community at large. Their proceedings were generally secret. They levied taxes but rendered no account of how they expended them. Neglecting the needs of the community for proper policing, paving, lighting, sanitation, they used the funds largely for self-gratification or personal advantage or the advantage of the party which they favored. In many of the smaller boroughs the mayor alone was practically the entire government. Generally speaking, those Englishmen who lived in boroughs were not only not self-governed, but were wretchedly misgoverned.

Municipal governments notoriously corrupt.

This system received its death-blow from the reform of Parliament. The two systems hung together, were mutually interdependent. The reform of one had, as an inevitable consequence, the reform of the other. The power of the privileged class in the House of Commons had rested largely upon the ease with which they had been able to secure control of these little local oligarchies, which had had the right to elect the members of the boroughs to the House. In 1833 a commission was appointed to investigate the whole subject, which it did with convincing thoroughness.

The reform of municipal government.

In 1835 a law was passed, the Municipal Corporations Act, second in importance only to the Reform Bill. This act provided for the election of town councilors by all the inhabitants who had paid taxes during the preceding three years. This established a property and residence qualification. The town council was to elect the mayor. The town council and the constituency together formed the corporation. The proceedings of the council were to be public; the accounts were to be published and audited. Not only were property owners but property renters included in the new electorate. Those who rented property that was on the tax lists as worth ten pounds a year had the right to vote as well as those who paid taxes themselves; in other words, a man who paid a rent of about a dollar a week for his house or his store was now enfranchised. This bill did not apply to London, reserved for special treatment, nor to sixty-seven boroughs, which were very small, but concerned 178 boroughs, the large majority. It is estimated that about two million people were affected by it. The bill was not a democratic measure, but it gave borough government, as the bill of 1832 had given parliamentary, to the wealthy and the middle classes. It effectually restored self-government. The basis of representation has been widened since 1835. A similar act for Scotland, sweeping away abuses even more glaring, had been passed in 1833.

In the midst of this period of reform occurred a change in the occupancy of the throne. King William IV died June 20, 1837, and was succeeded by his niece, Victoria. The young Queen was the daughter of the Duke of Kent, fourth son of George III. She was, at the time of her accession, eighteen years of age. She had been carefully educated, but owing to the fact that William IV disliked her mother, she had seen very little of court life, and was very little known. Carlyle, oppressed with all the weary weight of this unintelligible world, pitied her, quite unnecessarily. "Poor little Queen!" said he, "she is at an age at which a girl can hardly be trusted to choose a bonnet for herself; yet a task is laid upon her from which an archangel might shrink." Not such was the mood of the Queen. She was buoyant and joyous, and entered with zest upon a reign which was to prove the longest in the annals of England. She impressed all who saw her with her dignity and poise. Her political education was conducted under the guidance, first of Leopold, King of Belgium, her uncle, and after her accession, of Lord Melbourne, both of whom instilled in her mind the principles of constitutional monarchy. The question of her marriage was important and was decided by herself. Summoning her cousin, Prince Albert of Saxe-Coburg, into her presence, she offered him her hand—"a nervous thing to do," as she afterward said, yet the only thing as "he would never have presumed to take such a liberty" himself as to ask for the hand of the Queen of England. The marriage, celebrated in 1840, was a marriage of affection. "She is as full of love as Juliet," said Sir Robert Peel. Her married life was exceptionally happy, and when the Prince Consort died twenty-one years later, she was inconsolable. During these years he was her constant adviser, and so complete was the harmony of their views that he was practically quite as much the ruler of the country as was she.

Accession of Queen Victoria.

Her political education.

The early years of the new reign were years of trouble and unrest. The accession of Victoria brought to an end

Hanover.

the connection between England and Hanover, which had existed since the elector of Hanover had become king of Great Britain in 1714, under the name of George I. As the Salic law obtained in Hanover that kingdom now passed to the uncle of the Queen, the Duke of Cumberland, Ernest Augustus. This was, on the whole, more a gain for England than a loss, as it freed her from vexatious entanglements on the Continent. Far more serious was the disruption of the colonial empire, threatened by the Canadian Rebellion of 1837. This will be described elsewhere. More serious still was the widespread unrest and discontent in England itself, an unrest that found expression in the Chartist Movement.

The Radicals and the Reform Bill.

The Reform Bill of 1832 had been carried by a combination of Liberals and Radicals, the latter furnishing in those exciting days the appearance and the reality of physical force, the monster meetings, the riots, which had made the Tories feel that a civil war would result if they did not yield to what was manifestly the people's will. A breach between these two elements now ensued. The Radicals looked upon the measure, to the passing of which they had so greatly contributed, as merely a step in the right direction, from which they themselves had gained nothing. They were a genuinely democratic party, aiming at the introduction into England of truly democratic government, popular control of the House of Commons and legislation in the interest of the people, that is, the great mass of the workers of Great Britain. But when, after 1832, they attempted to bring forward measures for a wider suffrage as a necessary preliminary to all this, they met with uncompromising opposition on the part of their former allies. Lord John Russell took occasion to say publicly in 1837 that the Reform Act of 1832 had been made as extensive as possible in the hope that it might be final; and that the question of the franchise ought not to be reopened. The leader of the Liberals had spoken. It was clear that the Conservatives would be of

the same mind on this matter. There had been a reform in 1832 in the interest of the middle classes. Clearly there was to be no reform in the interest of the lower classes. The middle classes had said so. The Radicals felt that a middle class Parliament would consider simply the interests of the middle class, and they desired a democratic Parliament to legislate for the masses of the laborers of England, whether in town or country, for the laborers were the *nation*. The breach between the former allies became complete. The Radicals dubbed Lord John, "Finality Jack." They began a vehement agitation for further reform. Workingmen's associations, socialist societies, the discontented generally worked together.

The Radicals agitate for further reform.

In a pamphlet entitled *The Rotten House of Commons* (December 1836), Lovett, one of their leaders, proved from official returns that, out of 6,023,752 adult males living in the United Kingdom, only 839,519 were voters. He also showed that despite the reform of 1832 there were great inequalities among the constituencies, that twenty members were chosen by 2,411 votes, twenty more by 86,072. The immediate demands of the Radicals were expressed in "The People's Charter," or programme, a petition to Parliament drawn up in 1838. They demanded that the right to vote be given to every adult man, declaring, "we perform the duties of freemen, we must have the privileges of freemen"; that voting be secret, by ballot rather than orally as was then the custom, so that every voter could be free from intimidation, and less exposed to bribery; that property qualifications for membership in the House be abolished; and that the members receive salaries so that poor men, laborers themselves and understanding the needs of laborers, might be elected to Parliament if the voters wished. They also demanded that the House of Commons should be elected, not for seven years, as was then the law, but simply for one year. The object of this was to prevent their representatives misrepresenting them by proving faithless to their

The People's Charter.

pledges or indifferent or hostile to the wishes of the voters. Annual elections would give the voters the chance to punish such representatives speedily by electing others in their place. "The connection between the representatives and the people, to be beneficial, must be intimate," said the petition. Such were the five points of the famous Charter designed to make Parliament representative of the *people*, not of a class. Once adopted, it was felt that the masses would secure control of the legislature and could then improve their conditions.

Character of the Chartist agitation.

The Chartists had almost no influence in Parliament, and their agitation had consequently to be carried on outside in workingmen's associations, in the cheap press, in popular songs and poems, in monster meetings addressed by impassioned orators, in numerous and unprecedentedly large petitions. One of these was presented in 1839. It was in the form of a large cylinder of parchment about four feet in diameter, and was said to have been signed by 1,286,000 persons. The petition was summarily rejected. Notwithstanding this failure another was presented in 1842, signed, it was asserted, by over three million persons. Borne through the streets of London in a great procession it was found too large to be carried through the door of the House of Commons. It was therefore cut up into several parts and deposited on the floor. This, too, was rejected.

The Chartist movement lasted about ten years, from 1838 to 1848. It had periods of quiet, followed by periods of great activity. The latter were generally contemporary with hard times. The whole movement was born of the great distress and misery of the English working class.

The lack of able leadership.

Unfortunately it lacked able leadership. Many of its supporters were men of ability, devotion, and disinterestedness, but during most of the time the real leader was Feargus O'Connor, an able orator, but a weak, vain, unstable man, who knew better how to alienate those who naturally wished to co-operate than to consolidate and

magnify a party. The Chartists themselves divided into two groups: those who wished to use only peaceful methods in their agitation, and those who wished to make an ultimate appeal to physical force, believing the other method entirely ineffective. Whenever the physical-force Chartists attempted to act according to their principle they were severely punished.

The petition of 1848.

The Chartists could look to neither great party for aid. The movement smoldered on for ten years, blazing up threateningly in times of unusual distress. Indeed, it was a kind of barometer, measuring the misery of the people and their sense of injustice. After 1848 the movement subsided. Encouraged by the French Revolution of that year the Chartists held a great national convention or people's parliament in London, and planned a vast demonstration on behalf of the Charter. Half a million men were to accompany a new petition to Parliament, which it was expected would be overawed and would then yield to so imposing a demand of an insistent people. The Government was so alarmed that it entrusted the safety of London to the Duke of Wellington, then seventy-nine years of age. His arrangements were made with his accustomed thoroughness. One hundred and seventy thousand special constables were enrolled, one of whom was Louis Napoleon, who before the year was out was to be President of the French Republic. The result was that the street demonstration was a failure, and the petition, examined by a committee of the House, was found to contain, not 5,706,000 signatures, as asserted, but less than two million. It was summarily rejected. The movement died out owing to ridicule, internal quarrels, but particularly because of the growing prosperity of the country, which resulted from the abolition of the Corn Laws and the adoption of Free Trade.

The significance of the movement.

It is difficult to appraise the value and significance of this movement. Judged superficially and by immediate results the Chartists failed completely. Yet most of the changes they

advocated have since been brought about. There are now no property qualifications for members of the House of Commons, and the secret ballot has been secured; the suffrage is enjoyed by the immense majority of men, though not by all; the payment of members has in principle been approved by the House of Commons (1906), though not yet put in force. Parliaments are still elected for seven years. It seems that some of the tremendous impetus of England toward democracy, which grew so marked toward the close of the nineteenth century, was derived from this movement of which Carlyle wrote in 1839: "The matter of Chartism is weighty, deep-rooted, far-extending; did not begin yesterday; will by no means end this day or to-morrow."

Simultaneously with the Chartist Movement another was going on which had a happier issue. The adoption of the principle of free trade must always remain a great event in English history, and was the culmination of a remarkable movement that extended over forty years, though its most decisive phase was concentrated into a few years of intense activity. The change was complete from a policy which England in common with the rest of the world had followed for centuries.

England's policy of Protection.

In 1815 England believed thoroughly in protection. Hundreds of articles were subject to duties as they entered the country, manufactured articles, raw materials. English shipping was also protected by the Navigation Laws. The most important single interest among all those protected was agriculture. Parliament in 1815 was a parliament of landlords, and their legislation was naturally favorable to their interest. Corn is a word used in England to describe wheat and bread stuffs generally. The laws imposing duties on corn were the keystone of the whole system of protection, because they affected the most influential class in the nation and the one, moreover, which made the laws. The advocates of free trade necessarily therefore delivered their fiercest

The Corn Laws.

assaults upon the Corn Laws. If these could be overthrown it was believed that the whole system would fall. Not until they were abolished would England be a free trade country. The Corn Law of 1815 forbade the importation of foreign corn until the price should have reached ten shillings a bushel. Later, in 1828, in place of the fixed duty, was put the so-called sliding scale, the duty on foreign grain going up as the price of domestic grain fell, and decreasing as the home price rose. But the object was the same, high protection of British grain growers. This was the particular feature which the reformers attacked. But for a long while the landlord class was so entrenched in political power that the law remained impregnable. Small and piecemeal attacks were therefore made upon other parts of the system. Huskisson in 1823-5 succeeded in carrying through a modification of the Navigation Laws of 1651. Previously all commerce between England and her colonies had to be carried on in English ships; and all commerce between England and any other country had to be carried on by English ships or by those of the country concerned. An act was passed in 1823 empowering the Government to conclude reciprocity treaties with foreign countries, admitting their ships to British ports on the same conditions as British ships, if they would put British shipping on the same footing of equality with their own in their ports. This opened the way for the ultimate abolition of all restraints upon navigation. Huskisson also succeeded in securing legislation reducing duties on almost all foreign manufactures and on many raw materials. These changes were a beginning in the direction of freer trade, but they did not touch the strongest interest, the landowners, protected by the Corn Laws.

Huskisson's reforms.

For the next few years public interest was absorbed in the various reforms already described. In 1841 the Whig party, then under the leadership of Lord Melbourne, the successor to Earl Grey, was overthrown, and Sir Robert Peel, leader of the Conservatives, became prime minister.

Sir Robert Peel's ministry.

His ministry lasted from 1841 to 1846. The financial condition of the state was bad, and the distress of the laboring classes general and acute. To provide a surplus in place of a deficit, and to relieve trade Peel carried through an extensive tariff reform. In 1842 there were about 1,200 articles subject to tariff duties. Peel succeeded in abolishing or reducing the rates on about 750 of them. But the most important interest still remained essentially unaffected. The great struggle for free trade came over the Corn Laws.

The Anti-Corn-Law League.

In 1839 there was founded, in Manchester, a great manufacturing center, the Anti-Corn-Law League. Its leader was Richard Cobden, a young business man, successful, traveled, thoughtful. Cobden was convinced that the Corn Laws interfered with the growth of British manufactures. He was soon joined by John Bright, like himself a manufacturer, unlike him, one of the great popular orators of the nineteenth century. The League, under these two leaders, and Villiers, a member of Parliament, began an earnest agitation. It attempted to convince Englishmen that they should completely reverse their commercial policy in the interest of their own prosperity. The methods of the League were business-like and thorough. Its campaign was one of persuasion. It distributed a vast number of pamphlets, setting forth the leading arguments. Lecturers were sent to the large cities and to small country towns. In a single year four hundred lectures were delivered to 800,000 persons. A purely voluntary movement, gifts poured in until in 1845 the League was spending a million and a quarter dollars. Year after year this process of argumentation went on.

The arguments for Free Trade.

This free trade party consisted of manufacturers and merchants. The manufacturers felt that they did not need protection against foreigners, as they believed that their own processes were so far superior that the latter could not compete with them. The home market would remain theirs even if French and German manufacturers were at entire liberty to send their commodities into England

duty free. They also believed that it was absolutely essential for them to gain foreign markets, and that this could not be done under the existing system. Increase your foreign markets, they said, and you increase the employment of Englishmen in English factories, a thing of utmost importance as the population is growing rapidly. You will only be permitted to export freely to other countries if you consent to take freely in payment the commodities of those countries, their grain, their timber. If you will take these, they will purchase your woolens, your cottons, your hardware, and will not attempt to manufacture these themselves. If you do not, you will foster the growth of foreign competitors in manufacturing and will make them rivals in the markets of Europe, a suicidal policy. "In France," said one orator, "there are millions willing to clothe themselves in English garments, and you have millions of hungry mouths to take their corn. In Hungary, not being able to sell their corn to England, the people are turning their capital to manufacturing their own cloth." Replying to the argument that the removal of the Corn Laws would mean the ruin of English agriculture, which it was necessary to encourage in order that the country might produce an adequate food supply for its own needs, and not become dependent on other countries for the very necessaries of life, they pointed to Holland, declaring that it was "dependent upon every country, that there were no corn laws, yet no scarcity of food, that wages were high and trade brisk." One of the most effective arguments was that the time had come when the increasing population needed cheap food.

The Irish famine.

This agitation extended over seven years. It was conducted quite independently of political parties. It does not seem, however, that the repeal of the Corn Laws could have been carried had it not been for a great natural calamity, the Irish famine of 1845. "Famine itself, against which we had warred, joined us," said John Bright. The food of the vast majority of the Irish people was the

potato. More than half of the eight million inhabitants of Ireland depended on it alone for sustenance, and with a large part of the rest it was the chief article of diet. A failure in the potato crop could mean nothing less than famine. In the fall of 1845 this was precisely what impended, for a potato disease had set in and it was evident that the crop would be hopelessly ruined. Potatoes could not be obtained from foreign countries which, fearing for themselves, were forbidding their exportation. At the same time the English grain crops were very poor, and foreign grain could not be bought by these Irish peasants, so high was the duty. The alternatives seemed unavoidable, either starvation for multitudes or cheap grain, which could be obtained only by the repeal of the Corn Laws. The famine came, and tens of thousands perished of starvation. Great charitable gifts from England and America aimed to relieve the distress but proved inadequate. Finally, in 1846, Sir Robert Peel carried against bitter opposition the repeal of the Corn Laws by a combination of Conservative and Liberal votes.[1] But in so doing he split his party. The bill was passed by 223 Liberals and 104 Conservatives, against 229 Conservatives. Peel had come into office in 1841 the head of a party pledged to the support of the Corn Laws; in 1846 he repealed them against the passionate opposition of two-thirds of his own party. The vengeance of the protectionists was not long in coming. Peel was shortly overthrown by their votes, after having revolutionized the commercial policy of Great Britain. Peel had been converted to the theory of free trade some time before the Irish crisis. That crisis simply gave an irresistible practical reason for putting the theory into immediate effect.

Repeal of the Corn Laws.

There still remained after this many duties for protective purposes in the English tariff, but the keystone of the whole system was removed. In 1849 the Navigation

[1] Until 1849 there was still to be a duty, but a slight one, on corn. Then a nominal one of a shilling a quarter. This was abolished in 1869.

Laws were finally abolished, and the ships of all the world might compete with English ships for the carrying trade to England and her colonies, might enter British harbors as freely as British ships might. In 1853 Mr. Gladstone succeeded in having the duties removed from 123 articles, and reduced on 133 others. In 1860 the number of commodities subject to the tariff was reduced to 48. In 1866 the duty on lumber was abolished. England now has a tariff, but it is for revenue only, not for the protection of English industries. Nearly all of the revenue from the tariff, which now amounts to over a hundred and sixty million dollars, comes from the duties on tobacco, tea, spirits, wine, and sugar. England is absolutely dependent upon other countries for her food supplies. It was evident as early as 1845 that English agriculture could not support England's population.

Remaining protective duties gradually removed.

The twenty years succeeding the repeal of the Corn Laws were years of quiescence and transition. Comparatively few changes of importance were made in legislation. Those of greatest significance concerned the regulation of employment in factories and mines. Such legislation, merciful in its immediate effects and momentous in the reach of the principles on which it rested, was enacted particularly during the decade from 1840 to 1850. The initial step in such legislation had been taken in the Factory Act of 1833, already described, a law that regulated somewhat the conditions under which children and women could be employed in the textile industries. But labor was unprotected in many other industries, in which gross abuses prevailed. One of the most famous parliamentary reports of the nineteenth century was that of a commission appointed to investigate the conditions in mines. Published in 1842, its amazing revelations revolted public opinion and led to quick action. It showed that children of five, six, seven years of age were employed underground in coal mines, girls as well as boys; that women as well as men

Labor legislation.

Regulation of labor in mines.

labored under conditions fatal to health and morals; that the hours were long, twelve or fourteen a day, and the dangers great. They were veritable beasts of burden, dragging and pushing carts on hands and knees along narrow and low passageways, in which it was impossible to stand erect. Girls of eight or ten carried heavy buckets of coal on their backs up steep ladders many times a day. The revelations were so astounding and sickening that a law was passed in 1842 which forbade the employment of women and girls in mines; and which permitted the employment of boys of ten for only three days a week.

Factory laws.

Once embarked on this policy of protecting the economically dependent classes, Parliament was forced to go further and further in the governmental regulation of private industry. In 1844 a law was passed which restricted the labor of children in factories to half of each day, or six and a half hours, or the whole of every other day, the labor of women to twelve hours, and also restricting night work still further. The Factory Act of 1847, altered somewhat by an act of 1850, practically established a ten-hour day for labor, a demand long urged by the laboring class and bitterly opposed by manufacturers as ruinous to industry, as certain to lower wages, and to drive capital to foreign countries, by economists as in violation of the "laws" of political economy, by both as a violation of the right of free contract.

Morley on the labor code.

Since then a long series of similar statutes has been enacted by the English Parliament, which it is here impossible to describe, so extensive and minute, that Morley, writing nearly thirty years ago, and speaking of the Factory and Workshop Consolidation Act of 1878, an act of more than fifty printed pages, virtually a labor code, could say: "We have to-day a complete, minute, and voluminous code for the protection of labor; buildings must be kept pure of effluvia; dangerous machinery must be fenced; children and young persons must not clean it while in motion; their hours

are not only limited, but fixed; continuous employment must not exceed a given number of hours, varying with the trade, but prescribed by the law in given cases; a statutable number of holidays is imposed; the children must go to school, and the employer must every week have a certificate to that effect; if an accident happens, notice must be sent to the proper authorities; special provisions are made for bake-houses, for lace-making, for collieries, and for a whole schedule of other special callings; for the due enforcement and vigilant supervision of this immense host of minute prescriptions, there is an immense host of inspectors, certifying surgeons, and other authorities, whose business it is 'to speed and post o'er land and ocean' in restless guardianship of every kind of labor, from that of the woman who plaits straw at her cottage door, to the miner who descends into the bowels of the earth, and the seaman who conveys the fruits and materials of universal industry to and fro between the remotest parts of the globe." [1]

Since 1878 the principle of governmental regulation has been much more extensively applied. The labor code of to-day is contained in the Factory and Workshop Act of 1901, called by Dicey "the most notable achievement of English socialism." [2]

Growth of trades-unions.

This mid-century period of English history, so sterile in political interest, is thus seen to be highly significant in the economic sphere. It was the period in which trade-unionism grew rapidly, solidified itself, perfected its machinery, and discussed and clarified the demands of the laboring class. The effect of this preliminary work was apparent later. Workingmen were receiving in their unions a kind of education in politics and management that was

[1] Morley, Life of Cobden, Ch. XIII.

[2] The Combination Act of 1800 which, in connection with the law of conspiracy then in force, made a trade union an unlawful association, was repealed in 1824. Since then such organizations have not been illegal. They have grown greatly and now enjoy strong legal protection. See Dicey, Law and Opinion in England, 95-102; 190-200; 266-272.

a valuable training for the use of the suffrage, when they should get it, as they did in 1867. Meanwhile they came to attach less importance to purely political privileges, such as those demanded by the Charter, and to study far more carefully social questions, arising from the relations of capital and labor. During these years a remarkable change of opinion was going on. The beauties of individualism were seen to be less attractive; the advantages of collectivism or socialism were more and more emphasized. The economic and social beliefs of large classes of the population were undergoing a profound transformation. The revolution of thought was one tending distinctly toward socialism.[1] This transformation was proceeding quietly, and its significance did not become apparent until after the passage of the Reform Bill of 1867.

The growth of collectivism.

This period of comparative inaction in England was a time of great and stirring events and changes abroad, the period of the revolutions of 1848, of the Crimean War, in which England played a leading part, of the making of Italy, the rise of Prussia, the dismemberment of Denmark, the humiliation of Austria, the Civil War in the United States. The foreign policy of the ministry was active, the domestic very subordinate.

Jews admitted to the House of Commons.

Yet during these years certain internal reforms were carried through, which are worthy of mention. In 1858 under the Derby-Disraeli ministry Jews were permitted to sit in the House of Commons; the oath required of members containing the words "on the true faith of a Christian," was altered, and thus another piece of religious intolerance was removed, another step in the secularization of the state taken, and a controversy of twenty-five years terminated. Another reform of the same session was the abolition of the property qualification for members of Parliament. Thus

[1] On this subject see the remarkable Chapter VII, in Dicey, Law and Opinion in England, entitled, "The Growth of Collectivism." On Trade Unionism see Bright, History of England, IV, 401-406.

one point of the Charter was registered quietly. The government of India also was greatly altered.

Gladstone, Chancellor of the Exchequer.

During many of these years Gladstone was Chancellor of the Exchequer (1852-1855; 1859-1866), and in this capacity was winning the name of the greatest finance minister since Peel, and was laying deep the foundations of his later power. His policy was economy, and the completion of the free trade policy, which he believed would augment the prosperity of England.

By the year 1860 the tariff list had been reduced to 48 articles. Largely through Gladstone's efforts the excise duty on paper was abolished, thus furthering the publication of books and papers at a price within the reach of the masses.

Postal savings banks.

Gladstone also carried through a great scheme of using the post offices of England as savings banks. Thus each locality could have its saving banks without the creation of an entirely new and elaborate machinery. The system went into force in 1861, and has proved very successful in encouraging thrift among the working classes. Before the end of 1862, 180,000 accounts had been opened. Since then the deposits have increased each year. In 1907 these postal savings banks had deposits of £157,500,000, and the number of depositors was nearly 10,700,000. Deposits may be made from a shilling upward. The interest is small, but the security, that of the State, is perfect. Every little hamlet thus has its institution for savings, the local post office. Walpole calls this use of the post office "the most efficient machinery for the encouragement of thrift that the world had ever seen, or the imagination of man had ever conjectured." Two years later, in 1864, Mr. Gladstone was able to follow up this success by another,

State insurance.

using the same machinery of the post office for the selling of small life insurance policies, to the maximum amount of a hundred pounds. Thus workingmen with small incomes were enabled to insure their lives cheaply, and with a sense of absolute safety.

Industrial and scientific progress.

While from the point of view of politics, of internal reforms effected by legislation, this period, from 1846 to 1866, is unusually barren and insignificant, changes of great importance were occurring in the domain of industry and science. The printing press was being perfected, which cheapened vastly the cost of production of newspapers and books, rendering the large circulation possible, which is so characteristic and vital a feature of the modern world, and which has contributed immensely to the democratic evolution of England. Railway construction advanced rapidly, the drawing power of locomotives was greatly augmented, iron ships were supplanting wooden, machinery was applied to agriculture, the sewing machine, which astonishingly lightened the work of the home, and which inaugurated a revolution in the clothing trade, was being very widely adopted, implements of war were being increased in power and deadliness. During this period the Atlantic Cable was finally laid, after great and distressing failures, by an American, Cyrus Field, supported by British capitalists. As a consequence, cables were later laid in every direction, which were to bind the whole world together by their rapid transmission of news, profoundly altering the conditions of commerce and international relations.[1]

During the period of transition just described, England was outgrowing old forms of thought and organization, was evidently tending toward democracy. Yet this general trend was not mirrored in her political life and institutions. Parliament remained what the Reform Bill of 1832 had made it. From 1832 to 1867 there was no alteration either in the franchise or in the distribution of seats in the House of Commons. This was the era of middle class rule, as its predecessor had been one of aristocratic rule.

But during this period the demand was frequently made that the suffrage be extended. Not more than one man

[1] On this remarkable chapter of history see Walpole, History of Twenty-five Years, I, Ch. 7.

in six then had the right to vote. The demand was pressed by the Chartists from 1838 to 1848. After that, from time to time, proposals were made in Parliament to enlarge the electorate. Bills to this effect were introduced in 1852, 1854, 1859, and 1860, but none of them progressed far. Both parties treated them gingerly and with trepidation. Furthermore, the exceptional position held by one man in English public life during these years, Lord Palmerston, was a deterrent, for Palmerston was strongly opposed to change in the institutions of England. So commanding was his personality that it came in a way to be tacitly understood that no change should be attempted as long as he remained in politics. But in 1865 Lord Palmerston died, and shortly afterward Lord Derby and Earl Russell passed from the scene of politics. In place of the old-time statesmen, two younger men, neither of whom feared innovation, occupied the center of the stage, Gladstone and Disraeli. Their rivalry constitutes the central thread of parliamentary history for many years.

The demand for a wider suffrage.

Then, too, the success of the United States in the Civil War greatly encouraged the democratic party in England, for it was considered a triumph of democracy over aristocracy. Moreover, in that war the sympathy of the working classes in England had been steadfastly with the North, though they suffered greatly from the war, while the upper classes had largely favored the South. The people, in other words, had been right, when the favored class had not, and when the ministry had so handled its relations with the United States as to leave an ugly feeling and a grave diplomatic difficulty behind to harass the coming years. Were not people who had shown such moral and intellectual qualities worthy of any share in the government of England? Thus the question of the further extension of the suffrage came once more prominently before the English people and Parliament.

Effect of the Civil War.

In 1866 Mr. Gladstone, leader of the House of Commons,

Gladstone introduces a reform bill.

under Earl Russell as prime minister, brought forward a bill to enlarge the electorate. Earl Russell had himself of recent years been favorable to reform. By the bill of 1832 the suffrage was given in the boroughs to those owning or "occupying" houses or buildings yielding ten pounds a year. From 1832 to 1867 England was consequently ruled by the "ten pound householders." But five out of every six men could not meet this qualification, and were, therefore, without political power. The masses of working-men could not afford to pay ten pounds a year for the houses in which they lived.

The measure now introduced proposed but a slight change. In boroughs the suffrage was to be extended to seven pound householders. This would add only about 150,000 to the number of voters. The county franchise was not to be treated even as liberally as the borough. The timidity of this measure, and the half-hearted way in which it was urged, encouraged all the opponents of change, and failed to arouse any counteracting interest among the unenfranchised outside of Parliament.

The bill defeated.

The Conservatives were united against it, and a body of the Liberals joined them. There was no sign that the people wanted the measure, therefore this coalition did not hesitate to defeat it. The ministry resigned and Derby became prime minister, with Disraeli as leader of the House of Commons. The Conservatives were now in power, and the opponents of reform thought that they had effectually stemmed the advance toward democracy. Never were politicians more completely deceived. The people instantly became alert and indignant at the rejection of even so modest a measure. Gladstone, in his final speech on the bill, had exclaimed defiantly to his opponents, "You cannot fight against the future; time is on our side," a phrase that now became a battle cry. Gladstone, aroused, lost all his timidity and became a fiery apostle of an extensive reform. A determined effort was made to influence the people, and it succeeded.

Mr. Bright, with ill-concealed menace, incited the people to renew the scenes of 1832. "You know what your fathers did thirty-four years ago, and you know the result. The men who, in every speech they utter, insult the workingmen, describing them as a multitude given up to ignorance and vice, will be the first to yield when the popular will is loudly and resolutely expressed. If Parliament Street, from Charing Cross to the venerable Abbey, were filled with men seeking a Reform Bill these slanderers of their countrymen would learn to be civil, if they did not learn to love freedom." Under the influence of such incitement the people speedily lost their indifference, and great popular demonstrations of the familiar kind occurred in favor of the bill. The people were manifestly in earnest.

Reform carried by Disraeli.

Seeing this, and feeling that reform was inevitable, and that, such being the case, the Conservative party might as well reap the advantages of granting it as to allow those advantages to accrue to others, Disraeli in the following year, 1867, introduced a reform bill. This was remodeled almost entirely by the Liberals, who, led by Gladstone, defeated the proposals of the ministry time after time, and succeeded in having their own principles incorporated in the measure. The bill as finally passed was largely the work of Gladstone, practically everything he asked being in the end conceded, but it was the audacity and subtlety and resourcefulness of Disraeli that succeeded in getting a very radical bill adopted by the very same legislators who the year before had rejected a moderate one.

Provisions of the bill.

The bill as finally passed in August, 1867, closed the rule of the middle class in England, and made England a democracy. The franchise in boroughs was given to all householders. Thus, instead of ten pound or seven pound householders, all householders, whatever the value of their houses, were admitted; also, all lodgers who had occupied for a year lodgings of the value, unfurnished, of ten pounds, or about a dollar a week. In the counties the suffrage

was given to all those who owned property yielding five pounds clear income a year, rather than ten pounds, as previously; and to all occupiers who paid at least twelve pounds, rather than fifty pounds, as hitherto. Thus the better class of laborers in the boroughs, and practically all tenant farmers in the counties, received the vote. By this bill the number of voters was nearly doubled.[1]

So sweeping was the measure that the prime minister himself, Lord Derby, called it a "leap in the dark." Carlyle, forecasting a dismal future, called it "shooting Niagara." Robert Lowe, whose memorable attacks had been largely instrumental in defeating the meager measure of the year before, now said, "we must educate our masters." It should be noted that during the debates on this bill, John Stuart Mill made a strongly reasoned speech in favor of granting the suffrage to women. The House considered the proposition highly humorous. Nevertheless, this movement, then in its very beginning, was destined to persist and grow.

Acts, similar in principle though differing in detail, were passed in 1868 for Scotland and Ireland.

Redistribution of seats.

Also there was at this time some redistribution of seats from small boroughs to large towns and counties. There is little doubt that the Conservatives expected to be rewarded for passing the Reform Bill of 1867, as the Liberals had been for passing that of 1832, thought, that is, that the newly enfranchised would, out of gratitude, continue them in office. If so, they were destined to a great disappointment. The elections of 1868 resulted in giving the Liberals a majority of a hundred and twenty. Mr. Gladstone now became the head of the most notable Liberal ministry of modern times.

[1] Just before 1867 the county voters numbered 768,705; the borough voters 602,088. By 1871 the former had increased to 1,055,467; the latter to 1,470,956.



John Bright

CHAPTER XX

ENGLAND UNDER GLADSTONE AND DISRAELI

The Great Ministry.

Mr. Gladstone possessed a more commanding majority than any prime minister had had since 1832. As the enlargement of the franchise in 1832 had been succeeded by a period of bold and sweeping reforms, so was that of 1867 to be. Mr. Gladstone was a perfect representative of the prevailing national mood. The recent campaign had shown that the people were ready for a period of reform, of important constructive legislation. Supported by such a majority, and by a public opinion so vigorous and enthusiastic, Gladstone stood forth master of the situation. No statesman could hope to have more favorable conditions attend his entrance into power. He was the head of a strong, united, and resolute party. The ministry contained a remarkable array of able men. Mr. Bright was there, one of the most eloquent orators who have spoken the English tongue; Mr. Forster, Mr. Goschen, Mr. Lowe, and Lord Clarendon were also members.

William Ewart Gladstone, 1809-1898.

The man who thus became prime minister at the age of fifty-nine was one of the notable figures of modern English history. His parents were Scotch. His father had hewed out his own career, and from small beginnings had, by energy and talent, made himself one of the wealthiest and most influential men in Liverpool, and had been elected a member of Parliament. Young William Ewart Gladstone received "the best education then going" at Eton College and Oxford University, in both of which institutions he stood out among his fellows. At Eton his most intimate friend was Arthur Hallam, the man whose splendid eulogy is Tennyson's

In Memoriam. His career at Oxford was crowned by brilliant scholarly successes, and here he also distinguished himself as a speaker in the Union, the university debating club. In one of the discussions he denounced the Reform Bill of 1832, then pending in Parliament, as destined to change the form of government and subvert the social order. Before leaving the university his thought and inclination were to take orders in the church, but his father was opposed to this and the son yielded. In 1833 he took his seat in the House of Commons as representative for one of the rotten boroughs which the Reform Bill of the previous year had not abolished. He was to be a member of that body for over sixty years, and for more than half that time its leading member. Before attaining the premiership, therefore, in 1868, he had had a long political career and a varied training, had held many offices, culminating in the Chancellorship of the Exchequer and the leadership of the House of Commons. Beginning as a Conservative (Macaulay called him in 1838 the "rising hope of the stern and unbending Tories"), he came under the influence of Sir Robert Peel, a man who, conservative by instinct, was gifted with unusual prescience and adaptability, and who possessed the courage required to be inconsistent, the wisdom to change as the world changed. Gladstone had, after a long period of transition, landed in the opposite camp, and was now the leader of the Liberal Party. By reason of his business ability, shown in the management of the nation's finances, his knowledge of parliamentary history and procedure, his moral fervor, his elevation of tone, his intrepidity and courage, his reforming spirit, and his remarkable eloquence, he was eminently qualified for leadership. When almost sixty he became prime minister, a position he was destined to fill four times, displaying marvelous intellectual and physical energy. His administration, lasting from 1868-1874, is called the Great Ministry. The key to his policy is found in his remark to a friend when the summons came from

Entrance into Parliament.

Leader of the Liberal Party.

Gladstone's First Ministry, 1868-1874.

the Queen for him to form a ministry: "My mission is to pacify Ireland." The Irish question, in fact, was to be the most absorbing interest of Mr. Gladstone's later political career, dominating all four of his ministries.

Dominance of Irish questions.

To understand the question, a brief survey of Irish history in the nineteenth century is necessary. Ireland was all through the century the most discontented and wretched part of the British Empire. While England constantly grew in numbers and wealth, Ireland decreased in population, and her misery increased. In 1815 Ireland was inhabited by two peoples, the native Irish, who were Catholics, and settlers from England and Scotland, who were for the most part Anglicans or Presbyterians. The latter were a small but powerful minority.

The fundamental cause of the Irish question lies in the fact that Ireland is a conquered country, that the Irish are a subject race. As early as the twelfth century the English began to invade the island. Attempts made by the Irish at various times during six hundred years to repel and drive out the invaders only resulted in rendering their subjection more complete and more galling. Irish insurrections have been pitilessly punished, and race hatred has been the consuming emotion in Ireland for centuries. The contest has been unequal, owing to the far greater resources of England during all this time. The result of this turbulent history was that in 1815 the Irish were a subject people in their own land, as they had been for centuries, and that there were several evidences of this so conspicuous and so burdensome that most Irishmen could not pass a day without feeling the bitterness of their situation. It was a hate-laden atmosphere which they breathed.

Ireland a conquered country.

The marks of subjection were various. The Irish did not own the land of Ireland, which had once belonged to their ancestors. The various conquests by English rulers had been followed by extensive confiscations of the land. Particularly extensive was that of Cromwell. These lands

The agrarian question.

were given in large estates to Englishmen. The Irish were mere tenants, and most of them tenants-at-will, on lands that now belonged to others. The Irish have always regarded themselves as the rightful owners of the soil of Ireland, have regarded the English landlords as usurpers, and have desired to recover possession for themselves. Hence there has arisen the agrarian question, a part of the general Irish problem.

The religious question.

Again, in 1815 the Irish were the victims of religious intolerance. At the time of the Reformation they remained Catholic, while the English separated from Rome. Attempts to force the Anglican Church upon them only stiffened their opposition. Nevertheless, in 1815 they were paying tithes to the Anglican Church in Ireland, though they were themselves ardent Catholics, never entered a Protestant church, and were supporting their own churches by voluntary gifts. Thus they contributed to two churches, one alien, which they hated, and one to which they were devoted. Thus a part of the Irish problem was the religious question.

The political question.

Again, in 1815 the Irish did not make the laws which governed them. In 1800 their separate Parliament in Dublin was abolished, and from 1801 there was only one Parliament in Great Britain, that in London. While Ireland henceforth had its quota of representatives in the House of Commons, it was always a hopeless minority. Moreover, the Irish members did not really represent the large majority of the Irish, as no Catholic could sit in the House of Commons. There was this strange anomaly that, while the majority of the Irish could vote for members of Parliament, they must vote for Protestants—a bitter mockery. The Irish demanded the right to govern themselves. Thus another aspect of the problem was purely political.

The abuse just mentioned was removed in 1829,[1] when Cath-

[1] Catholics were permitted to hold offices after 1828 by the abolition of the Test Acts.

olic Emancipation was carried, which henceforth permitted Catholics to sit in the House of Commons. The English statesmen granted this concession only when forced to do so by the imminent danger of civil war. The Irish consequently felt no gratitude. Moreover, at the moment when Catholics were being admitted to Parliament, most of them lost their vote by the much higher franchise qualification enacted at the same time, for the qualification was raised in Ireland from forty shillings to ten pounds, though for England it remained at forty shillings. Shortly after Catholic Emancipation had been achieved, the Irish, under the matchless leadership of O'Connell, endeavored by much the same methods to obtain the repeal of the Union between England and Ireland, effected in 1801, and to win back a separate legislature and a large measure of independence. This movement, for some time very formidable, failed completely, owing to the iron determination of the English that the union should not be broken, and to the fact that the leader, O'Connell, was not willing in last resort to risk civil war to accomplish the result, recognizing the hopelessness of such a contest. This movement came to an end in 1843. However, a number of the younger followers of O'Connell, chagrined at his peaceful methods, formed a society called "Young Ireland," the aim of which was Irish independence and a republic. They rose in revolt in the troubled year, 1848. The revolt, however, was easily put down.

Catholic Emancipation.

The repeal movement.

As if Ireland did not suffer enough from political and social evils, an appalling catastrophe of nature was added. The Irish famine of 1845-7, to which reference has already been made, was a tragic calamity, far-reaching in its effects. The repeal of the Corn Laws did not check it. The distress continued for several years, though gradually growing less. The potato crop of 1846 was inferior to that of 1845, and the harvests of 1848 and 1849 were far from normal. Charity sought to aid, but was insufficient. The government gave money, and later gave rations. In March

The Irish famine.

1847 over 700,000 people were receiving government support. In March and April of that year the deaths in the workhouses alone were more than ten thousand a month. Peasants ate roots and lichens, or flocked to the cities in the agony of despair, hoping for relief. Multitudes fled to England or crowded the emigrant ships to America, dying by the thousand of fever or exhaustion. It was a long drawn out horror, and when it was over it was found that the population had decreased from about 8,300,000 in 1845 to less than 6,600,000 in 1851. Since then the decrease occasioned by emigration has continued. By 1881 the population had fallen to 5,100,000, by 1891 to 4,700,000, by 1901 to about 4,450,000. Since 1851 perhaps 4,000,000 Irish have emigrated. Ireland, indeed, is probably the only country whose population decreased in the nineteenth century.

Decline of the population.

For many years after the famine, and the failure of "Young Ireland" in 1848, Irish politics were quiescent. Year after year the ceaseless emigration to the United States continued. Finally, there was organized among the Irish in America a secret society, called the Fenians, whose purpose was to achieve the independence of the republic of Ireland. The Irish in the two countries co-operated, and in 1865 and 1866 were active. James Stephens, the leader in Ireland, announced that the flag of the Irish republic would be raised in 1865. The Government, alarmed, took stringent measures, arresting many of the leaders, and even securing from Parliament the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act in Ireland. In May 1866 the Fenians in the United States attempted an invasion of Canada. About 1,200 of them crossed the Niagara River, but were soon driven back, though only after blood had been shed. Several, taken prisoners, were tried by courts-martial and shot. In 1867 various Fenian outrages occurred in Ireland and in England. There were many arrests, trials, and some executions. The chief significance of the Fenian movement was

The Fenian movement.

the alarm it aroused in England, and the vivid evidence it gave of the unrest and deep-rooted discontent of Ireland. The Irish question thus became again an exciting topic for discussion, a problem pressing upon Parliament for solution.

When Gladstone came into power in 1868 he was resolved to pacify the Irish by removing some of their more pronounced grievances, the three branches of the Irish Upas tree, as he called them—the Irish Church, the Irish land laws, and Irish education. **The Upas tree.**

The question of the Irish Church was the first one attacked. This was the Anglican Church established and endowed in Ireland at the time of the Reformation. It was a branch of the Church of England. Its position was anomalous. It was a state church, yet it was the church not of the people, but of a small minority. Established to win over the Catholics to Protestantism, it had signally failed of its purpose. Its members numbered less than an eighth of the population. There were many parishes, about 150, in which there was not a single member. There were nearly 900 in which there were less than fifty members. Yet these places were provided with an Anglican clergyman and a place of worship, generally the former Catholic church building. The Church was maintained by its endowment and by the tithes which the Catholics, as well as the Protestants, paid. Sidney Smith said of this institution: "On an Irish Sabbath the bell of the neat parish church often summons to service only the parson and an occasional conforming clerk; while two hundred yards off, a thousand Catholics are huddled together in a miserable hovel, and pelted by all the storms of heaven," and he added, "There is no abuse like it in all Europe, in all Asia, in all the discovered parts of Africa, and in all that we have heard of Timbuctoo." This favored corporation did not even discharge its religious functions with zeal. Many a clergyman used his position simply for the salary attached, employed a curate to perform his duties, and himself lived in England. **The Irish Church.**

The tithe war.

The Irish resisted the payment of tithes, and the result was the so-called tithe war, in which the peasant's property, his cow or goat, his chickens or kettles, were seized and sold for payment. Even such methods were not successful. In 1833 only about 12,000 out of 104,000 pounds due could be collected. At length, in 1838, the system was abandoned. The tithes were made a tax upon the land, which simply meant that the peasants no longer paid them directly, but paid them indirectly in the form of the increased rent demanded by the landlord. The Catholics were still supporters of a wealthy and alien corporation. Meanwhile, their own priests were exceedingly poor, and their own services had to be held in the open air or in wretched buildings. The existence of this alien church was regarded as humiliating and oppressive.

Disestablishment of the Irish Church.

Gladstone in 1869 procured the passage of a law abolishing tithes, even in this roundabout form, and disestablishing and partly disendowing the Church. The Church henceforth ceased to be connected with the State. Its bishops lost their seats in the House of Lords. It became a voluntary organization and was permitted to retain a large part of its property as an endowment. The rest was to be appropriated as Parliament should direct. It was to have all the church buildings which it had formerly possessed. It was still very rich, but the connection with the Church of England was to cease January 1, 1871. The bill, though very favorable to the Church, was denounced as sheer robbery, as "highly offensive to Almighty God," as the "greatest national sin ever committed." Nevertheless, it passed and became law. One branch of the famous Upas tree had been lopped off.

System of land tenure.

Gladstone now approached a far more serious and perplexing problem—the system of land tenure. Ireland was almost exclusively an agricultural country, yet the land was chiefly owned, not by those who lived on it and tilled it, but by a comparatively small number of landlords, who held large estates. Many of these were Englishmen, ab-

sentees, who rarely or never came to Ireland, and who regarded their estates simply as so many sources of revenue. The business relations with their tenants were carried on by agents or bailiffs, whose treatment of the tenants was frequently harsh and exasperating. In the minds of the Irish their landlords were foreigners, who had acquired by robbery land which they regarded as rightly belonging to themselves. This initial injustice they never forgot. There had been from the beginning a wide gulf between the two. As, however, there were almost no industries in Ireland, the inhabitants were obliged to have land. They were, therefore, in an economic sense, at the mercy of the landlord. There was, properly speaking, no competition among landowners to rent their land, forcing them, therefore, to treat their tenants with some liberality and consideration. There was competition only among the applicants for land, applicants so numerous that they would offer to pay much more for a little plot on which to raise their potatoes, which furnished the chief food, than the value of the land justified. The result was that in many cases they could not pay the stipulated rent and were evicted. Their position only became still more deplorable, for land they must have or starve; consequently, they would promise a higher rent to some other landlord, with, in the end, another eviction as a result. Now, eviction was easy, because these petty farmers were tenants-at-will, that is, tenants who must leave their holdings at the will and pleasure of the landlord, or on short notice, generally six months, obviously a most insecure form of tenure. Lands were not rented for a year or five years or ten, but only as long as the owner should see fit. Occupation could be terminated abruptly by the landlord, starvation faced the peasant. Moreover, Irish landlords rented, as was correctly stated at the time, not farms, that is, land and the necessary buildings and improvements, but simply land. The tenant put up at his own expense such buildings and made such improvements in the way of fences, draining, clearing,

The land owned by a few.

Tenants-at-will.

No compensation for improvements.

fertilizing, as he could, or wished; in very many cases the land would have had no value whatever, but for these improvements. Yet, as the law then stood, when a landlord evicted his tenant he was not obliged to pay for any buildings or improvements made during the tenant's occupation. He simply appropriated so much property created by the tenant.

It would be hard to conceive a more unwise or unjust system. It encouraged indolence and slothfulness. The land was wretchedly cultivated, because good cultivation of it was penalized. Why should a tenant work hard to improve the quality of his holding, to erect desirable farm buildings, when he knew that this would merely mean a higher rent or his eviction in favor of some one who would offer a higher rent, in which case all his improvements would benefit others and not himself? In other words, it was a positive disadvantage to a tenant to be prosperous. If prosperous, he made efforts to conceal the fact, as did the peasants in pre-revolutionary France. Now, the social effects of this system were disastrous in the extreme. Chronic and shocking misery was the lot of the Irish peasantry. "The Irish peasant," says an official English document of the time, "is the most poorly nourished, most poorly housed, most poorly clothed of any in Europe; he has no reserve, no capital. He lives from day to day." His house was generally a rude stone hut, with a dirt floor. The census of 1841 established the fact that in the case of forty-six per cent. of the population, the entire family lived in a house, or, more properly, hut of a single room. Frequently the room served also as a barn for the live stock.

Industry and thrift penalized.

Misery of the peasantry.

Deeds of violence.

Stung by the misery of their position, and by the injustice of the laws that protected the landlord, and that gave them only two hard alternatives, surrender to the landlord, or starvation, and believing that when evicted they were also robbed, and goaded by the hopeless outlook for the future, the Irish, in wild rage, committed many atrocious agrarian crimes, murders, arson, the killing or maiming of cattle. This in turn brought a new coercion

law from the English Parliament, which only aggravated the evil.

Such was the situation. Mr. Gladstone, desiring to govern Ireland, not according to English, but according to Irish ideas, faced it resolutely. He had an important argument at hand. While the system just described was the one prevailing throughout most of Ireland, a different one had grown up in a single province, Ulster, the so-called system of "tenant right." The tenant's right was undisturbed possession of his holding as long as he paid his rent, and fair payment for all permanent improvements, in case he should relinquish his holding, whether voluntarily or because of inability to pay the rent. This was mere custom, not law. But the result was that the peasants of Ulster were hard-working and prosperous, whereas in the rest of Ireland the contrary was the case. The outgoing peasant received, as a matter of fact, for his improvements from five to twenty times the amount of his annual rent. It paid him, therefore, to make them. Mr. Gladstone took this local custom and made it a law for all Ireland. In the Land Act of 1870 it was provided that if evicted for any other reason than for the non-payment of rent, the tenant could claim compensation for disturbance from the landlord, and also that he was to receive compensation for all improvements of a permanent character on giving up his holding. It was hoped that thus the peasants would have a sense of security in their occupation, and that with security would come prosperity and peace.

The Ulster System.

Land Act of 1870.

There were certain other clauses in the bill, not greatly approved by Gladstone, but strongly urged by Mr. Bright, whose influence with the people Gladstone did not wish to alienate. Bright desired that the Irish peasants should gradually cease to be tenants of other people's land, and should become landowners themselves. This could only be done by purchasing the estates of the landlords, and this obviously the peasants were unable to do. The Bright

The Bright clauses.

clauses, therefore, provided that the State should help the peasant up to a certain amount, he in turn repaying the State for the money loaned by easy instalments, covering a long period of years. Accordingly, carefully guarded land purchase clauses were put into this bill.

The bill denounced as revolutionary.

The bill thus proposed went through Parliament with comparative ease. On one point it was vigorously attacked, the clause giving a tenant compensation from the landlord if the landlord evicted him for any other reason than for the non-payment of rent. This, said Disraeli, is revolutionary. It alters, by act of Parliament, the nature of property, the thing least to be tampered with safely by legislation. The landlord may no longer do what he will with his own. In place of absolute and uncontrolled ownership, you make the tenant part owner, for he can not be evicted as long as he pays his rent. You create a hybrid and dangerous form of land tenure, dual ownership. If you violate the sacredness of property in land, you may do it in other kinds, and thus the people will come to see that they can acquire property not alone by labor, but by taking another's by act of Parliament. To which the reply was that one's absolute right to property is conditioned upon its conducing to the public welfare, that restrictions may be imposed when in the interest of society as a whole, and that the principle of the factory acts, and of the laws regulating banking, corporations, trade unions, was the same. It was simply now being applied for the first time to land.

The Land Act a disappointment.

The Land Act of 1870 did not achieve what was hoped from it; did not bring peace to Ireland. Landlords found ways of evading it, and evictions became more numerous than ever. The act did not forbid landlords to raise their rents, and did not guarantee the tenant compensation for disturbance if he were evicted for non-payment of rent, only if evicted arbitrarily. Practically, then, it was easy for a landlord to get rid of any tenant he might wish to, by simply raising his rent to a point the tenant could not

meet. Nor did the land purchase clauses prove effective. Only seven sales were made up to 1877.

Its principles important.

Nevertheless, the bill was very important, because of the principles upon which it was based. One principle was that the landlord's ownership of the soil was not absolute and unrestricted, that the tenant was in some sense a partner in the land he tilled, in the soil of Ireland. Another was the desirability of enabling the tenant to become complete owner. The land-purchase section of the act proved ineffective, largely because very timidly applied, but it contained an idea that was to grow more and more attractive and to be applied in a long series of laws destined in the end to be highly successful. In the principles on which it was based, the Land Act of 1870 was path-breaking.

Educational reform

Another measure of this active ministry was designed to provide a national system of elementary education. The educational system of England was deplorably inadequate and inefficient, inferior to that of many other countries. England possessed the famous endowed schools of Eton, Rugby, Harrow, but these and others were for the aristocratic and prosperous middle classes. But she possessed no national system of public schools for the mass of the population. It was long the accepted opinion in England that education was no part of the duty of the State.

Church schools.

The work that the State neglected was discharged in a measure, by the various religious denominations. Whatever education the children of the working class received, they received in schools maintained by voluntary gifts, generally in connection with a church. Most of the schools were Anglican, some were Wesleyan, some Catholic, some Jewish. In 1833 Parliament appropriated the sum of 20,000 pounds in aid of schools established by voluntary effort. The sum was ludicrously small. Prussia at that time was spending many times as much for its popular education, and Prussia was a far poorer country and a smaller one. Nevertheless, Parliament tacitly recognized by this vote that the State

had a duty to perform in educating its citizens. The sum was enlarged to 30,000 pounds in 1839. Once embarked upon this course, there could be no turning back. The parliamentary grant grew greatly, and, between 1860 and 1865, it averaged annually not far from 700,000 pounds. With this encouragement the number of voluntary schools increased, but was, nevertheless, totally inadequate to the needs of the nation. It came to be generally admitted that this system would not suffice for the education of the people.

The system inadequate.

In 1869 it was estimated that of 4,300,000 children in need of education, 2,000,000 were not in school at all, 1,000,000 were in schools that received no grant from the government, were uninspected, and were generally of a very inferior character, and only 1,300,000 were in schools aided by the State and inspected by the State. Moreover, whatever facilities existed were unevenly distributed; many districts being entirely without schools.

The question becomes urgent.

Many forces combined now to make the question of popular education urgent. When the working classes in the boroughs were given the suffrage in 1867, the cause of education received a great stimulus. "We must educate our masters," was the watchword. Foreign countries were cited as examples. The northern states, which had conquered the southern in the American Civil War, were the home of the common school, and on the Continent men spoke of the victory of Prussia over Austria at Sadowa as the triumph of the Prussian schoolmaster, meaning that the Prussian army was the more intelligent. Moreover, the trades-unions, representing workingmen, favored popular education.

The Forster Education Act of 1870.

The Gladstone ministry carried, in 1870, a bill designed to provide England for the first time in her history with a really national system of elementary education. The system then established remained without essential change until 1902. It marked a great progress in the educational facilities of England. The bill did not establish an entirely new educational machinery to be paid for by the State and

managed by the State. It divided the country into school districts. It did not propose to establish new schools in each district to be administered by the State. Its aim was not to provide England with new secular schools, but to provide her with a sufficient number of schools of good quality. It incorporated in its scheme the already existing church schools. "Our object," said Mr. Forster, who was in charge of the bill, "is to complete the voluntary system, and to fill up the gaps." Each district was to be considered by itself. If, at the end of a year, it was found to possess already a sufficient number of schools, it was to be left alone. Such schools must submit to State inspection, and would then receive parliamentary aid. If the district were found to be inadequately supplied with schools of this character, then a new agency was to be created. Local school boards were to be elected with power to establish new schools, and to levy local taxes for the purpose.

Church schools incorporated in the system.

Thus there would be two sets of schools, church schools supported by voluntary contributions, by grants of Parliament, and by children's tuition fees, and "board schools," supported by grants of Parliament, tuition fees and local taxes.

Board schools established.

The main difficulty encountered by educational reformers in 1870, as had been the case before, and as is the case to-day, was the question of religious instruction. There was a party among the Liberals who wished to have education entirely secular, but this party was in the minority. The supporters of the voluntary schools wished to have those schools permitted to teach the tenets of the denomination as they had done in the past. There was inserted in this bill a so-called conscience clause, providing that where voluntary schools included as a part of their teaching instruction in the religious beliefs of the denomination conducting them, parents might have their children excused from such instruction. To facilitate the operation of this provision all religious instruction must be given at the

The question of religious instruction.

The conscience clause.

beginning or at the close of the school session. Thus the children of Methodists and Baptists could attend an Anglican school without being obliged to be instructed in the Anglican beliefs.

But should there be any religious instruction in the new board schools, schools to be supported in part by local taxes? A strong party demanded that these schools at least be entirely secular, but Parliament did not so decide.

The Cowper-Temple amendment.

The bill as passed provided that the board in each district should decide whether there should be religious instruction or not, but that if it permitted such instruction, "no catechism or religious formulary which is distinctive of any particular denomination," should be taught.[1] In other words there might be reading of the Bible and comment on it, but no instruction in any creed or dogma. Moreover, in board schools, as in voluntary, there should be a conscience clause, and a time schedule enabling parents to have their children excused from such exercises.

Education neither free, nor compulsory, nor secular.

The law of 1870 did not establish either free, or compulsory, or secular education. It adopted, under the restrictions indicated, denominational or voluntary schools, and allowed them to give denominational teaching, with, however, a conscience clause which rendered it possible, as has been said, for the son of a Methodist to attend an Episcopalian school. It permitted undenominational religious teaching in the board schools, but here, too, the conscience clause was attached. The schools were not free, but pupils were to pay tuition. It was held undesirable to relieve parents of all feeling of responsibility for the education of their children. School boards might, however, establish free public schools in districts where exceptional poverty prevailed or might pay the fees of poor children.

The Education Act of 1870 was a compromise between conflicting views. It did not create a national system of

[1] The Cowper-Temple amendment, which also provided that voluntary schools should receive no assistance from local taxes.

education throughout the land. It kept the denominational system and added another system to it. The bill was more acceptable to the opponents of the Liberal ministry, mainly Churchmen, than to its supporters and Non-Conformists. John Bright thought it the "worst act passed by any Liberal Parliament since 1832." Under it, however, popular education made great advances. In twenty years the number of schools more than doubled, and were capable of accommodating all those of school age. In 1880 attendance was made compulsory, and in 1891 made free.

The system just described remained in force till 1902, when a new education bill was passed.

Army reform.

Another reform carried through by this ministry, was that of the army, by the introduction of a short service with the colors, and a longer term in the reserve. Here we see, as we do everywhere in Europe, the tremendous influence of the Prussian military system, which had proved so victorious in the campaign culminating at Königgrätz. It had long been supposed that an army of veterans was the best. But Prussia had proved the contrary. There military service was compulsory but limited to a few years in the active army. Then the young men passed into the reserve, and might be called out if necessary. Military service was their profession for only a brief period. The Prussian army was consequently an army of young men in the prime of physical condition. Prussia's example has been followed since in all the great European armies. Universal obligatory service has never been adopted in England, but the period of active service of those enlisting was reduced by Gladstone so that the army became one of young men.

Introduction of short service.

But no real reform in the army could be accomplished without an additional change in its structure. Men obtained promotion in the British army by purchasing positions of higher rank. There was a definite schedule of prices fixed by royal ordinance. To be an ensign in the infantry cost 450 pounds, to be a lieutenant-colonel 4,500

pounds. But the regulation price was by no means the actual price. So eager were men to secure these positions that they offered much more. Having paid for his position an officer considered it his property, to be sold for what he could get for it. He had a vested interest. Manifestly this system was unfair to poor men, who might be meritorious and able soldiers, as practically the desirable positions in the army were open only to the wealthy class. Naturally the growing democratic feeling of England, expressed in many ways by this ministry, was impatient of a system which rendered the army an appendage of the aristocracy.

Abolition of the purchase system.

Gladstone brought in a bill to abolish purchase, paying present owners at the market price. "The nation," said he, "must buy back its own army from its own officers." Bitterly opposed by the officers and by their influential friends inside and outside Parliament, the ministry succeeded, however, in getting its bill through the Commons only to have it practically defeated in the House of Lords. Mr. Gladstone then took a step for which he was severely criticised. He advised the Queen to abolish purchase by royal ordinance, which could be done, as the whole system rested on royal ordinance, not upon an act of Parliament. In this way the system was abolished (1871), and promotion by merit substituted for promotion by purchase.

Civil Service reform.

In the same session in which the military career was thrown open to merit, regardless of wealth or rank, civil and academic careers were also made free to all classes. In 1870, by an Order in Council, the system of appointment to most positions in the Civil Service was put on the basis of standing in open competitive examinations. This system had earlier been applied to the Indian service. The step now taken was strongly opposed, and one argument was that it would result in eliminating the aristocratic class from the service and would fill all positions with a lower social class. Mr. Gladstone never shared this opinion, believing, indeed, that the better educated class would have

all the stronger hold upon the higher positions, as has proved to be the case, the greater part of the successful candidates for those positions being Oxford and Cambridge men.

The universities thrown open.

In 1871 the universities of England were made thoroughly national. The last remaining religious tests, which operated only to the advantage of the members of the Church of England, were abolished. Henceforth men of any religious faith or no religious faith could have all the advantages of university training and university degrees. This was another step in religious and intellectual liberty. It abolished another monopoly of the Established Church. The universities belonged henceforth to all Englishmen.

Introduction of the ballot.

Another reform carried through by this ministry was the Ballot Act of 1872. Voting up to this time had been *viva voce*. Each voter declared his candidate in public at the polling place. For over forty years the question of making the ballot secret had been discussed. Indeed, it was considered at the time of the Reform Bill of 1832. For years Grote, the historian of Greece, had brought the matter up annually for discussion in the House of Commons. The secret ballot was one of the demands of the Chartists. But the movement made no progress as the years went by. The argument for open voting was that, as voting is a trust, it must be discharged in a manner known of all men, that thus it makes for courage and a due sense of responsibility. If you render a man's vote secret you undermine the citizen's courage, you foster evasion. This was Lord Palmerston's view. It was at one time also Gladstone's, who made the ingenious discovery that the secret ballot had led to the fall of the Roman Republic. But the facts were apparent to all the world that public voting led to extensive bribery and scandalous corruption. Intimidation, also, could flourish under such a system, and now that the poorer people were enfranchised by the act of 1867 they plainly needed further protection in the exercise of their right. As Morley says, "Experience showed that without secrecy in its exercise, the

Reasons for secret voting.

suffrage was not free. The farmer was afraid of the landlord, and the laborer was afraid of the farmer; the employer could tighten the screw on the workman, the shopkeeper feared the power of his best customers, the debtor quailed before his creditor, the priest wielded thunderbolts over the faithful. Not only was the open vote not free, it exposed its possessor to so much bullying, molestation, and persecution that his possession came to be less of a boon than a nuisance."[1]

It was evident that whatever the abstract arguments might be, the concrete ones were all in favor of the secret ballot. A bill was finally passed in 1872 providing for the Australian system in voting, so called because of its use first in the colony of Victoria.

Gladstone's waning popularity.

Though Mr. Gladstone was losing popularity with every new reform, alienating in each case those affected disadvantageously by the measure in question, he still went on. He now approached the question of the third branch of the Upas tree, the system of Irish education. In February 1873 he introduced the Irish University Bill, designed to give adequate facilities to Ireland for higher education. That the facilities were not adequate was clear. There were in Ireland two universities, that of Dublin, which consisted of a single college, Trinity, a Protestant institution, though admitting Catholics to its courses and degrees, and Queen's University, established in 1845, and consisting of three colleges, at Belfast, Cork, and Galway. These were entirely secular; the Catholics called them "godless." The Catholics, constituting the mass of the population, desired a university of their own, endowed and authorized to grant degrees. There had been established some years before a so-called Catholic University of Dublin, but it was not empowered to grant degrees. Mr. Gladstone proposed in 1873 that there should be established a new university for the whole of Ireland, with which these various institutions and

The Irish University Bill.

[1] Morley, Gladstone, II, 366.

others should be affiliated. The new university was to be amply endowed. The bill made shipwreck, however, on the religious difficulty. It was provided that each college might be denominational and teach dogma if it chose, but the university was to be undenominational. Owing to the religious passions involved it was held that the university course should not include teaching in theology, moral philosophy, or modern history. The colleges might teach these subjects but not the university. There was added the remarkable provision that any professor might be suspended or removed from his position if he wilfully offended, in speaking or writing, the religious convictions of any student.

The religious difficulty.

This bill satisfied no one. Catholics pronounced against it, saying that they wanted a Catholic university, not an undenominational one. Protestants, on the other hand, felt that at the very time they were liberalizing Oxford and Cambridge by opening them to all, regardless of religious affiliations, they ought not to encourage bigotry and sectarianism in an Irish university. Moreover, the "gagging" clauses were bitterly denounced. A university which should teach neither modern history nor philosophy, and whose professors should not have freedom of speech would be in the eyes of reasonable men ridiculous and not worth establishing.

General dissatisfaction with the bill.

The opposition was very general and violent. Disraeli, feeling that the moment had come when it would be possible to overthrow the ministry, reviewed the whole record in a caustic speech, denouncing all its reforming measures as simply "harassing legislation," endangering all the institutions of England. To which John Bright retorted that if the Conservatives had been in the wilderness they would have condemned the Ten Commandments as "harassing legislation." The bill was defeated, and Gladstone resigned, but as the Conservatives would not take office at that moment he came back into power for a few months.

Not only did Gladstone's domestic legislation give offense to many interested sections of the population, and thus raise

Unpopularity of Gladstone's foreign policy.

up enemies, but his foreign policy was characterized by many as weak, humiliating for England, lowering her prestige, particularly his adoption of arbitration in the controversy with the United States over the *Alabama* matter.

The grievances of the United States against England because of her conduct during our Civil War were a dangerous source of friction between the two countries for many years. Mr. Gladstone agreed to submit them to arbitration, but as the decision of the Geneva Commission was against England (1872), his ministry suffered in popularity. Nevertheless, Mr. Gladstone had established a valuable precedent. This was the greatest victory yet attained for the principle of settling international difficulties by arbitration rather than by war. In this sphere also this ministry advanced the interests of humanity, though it drew only disadvantage for itself from its service.

The Alabama award.

The elections of 1874.

All the accumulated disaffection of six years found vent in the elections of 1874. The Liberals were defeated by a majority of fifty. The Conservatives entered office with Disraeli as prime minister and remained in power till 1880. Thus fell Gladstone's first and most successful administration, with a record of remarkable achievement in legislation and in administrative reform.

The Disraeli ministry.

Mr. Disraeli now found himself prime minister, chief of a party controlling by safe majorities both Houses of Parliament. His administration lasted from 1874 to 1880. It differed as strikingly from Gladstone's as his character differed from that of his predecessor. This was owing to several facts. The criticisms which his party had leveled at its opponents, of disturbing everything by harassing legislation, imposed upon him the obligation of leaving things alone, of inactivity in domestic legislation where possible, of effecting only mild reforms where reforms were necessary at all. Colonial and foreign affairs were the chief occupation of this ministry. Disraeli found the situation favorable and the moment opportune for impressing upon England the

political ideal, long germinating in his mind, succinctly called imperialism, that is the transcendant importance of breadth of view and vigor of assertion of England's position as a world power, as an empire, not as an insular state. In 1872 he had said: "In my judgment no minister in this country will do his duty who neglects any opportunity of reconstructing as much as possible our colonial empire, and of responding to those distant sympathies which may become the source of incalculable strength and happiness to this land." This principle Disraeli emphasized in act and speech during his six years of power. It was imperfectly realized under him; it was partially reconsidered and revised by Gladstone upon his return to power in 1880. But it had definitely received lodgment in the mind of England before he left power. It gave a new note to English politics. This is Disraeli's historic significance in the annals of British politics. He greatly stimulated interest in the British colonies. He invoked "the sublime instinct of an ancient people."

Imperialism.

Importance of the colonies emphasized.

The first two years of his administration were singularly uneventful. The work of the preceding six years was accepted and left in the main untouched. Laws were passed in the direction of economic improvement, to enable certain large towns to provide laborers with better dwellings, if they should wish to, to improve certain Friendly Societies so that the savings of the poor would be more secure, to provide a system of land registration, so that land titles might be more certain.

Disraeli had said that if Gladstone had been less eager to reform everything in England and more insistent upon maintaining her prestige abroad, it would have been better. He criticised the party as secretly undermining the Empire, as believing the Empire a burden, as looking upon the colonies simply in a financial light as a great and dubious expense. In opposition he spoke of the "cause of the Tory party" as the "cause of the British Empire," and he declared the "issue is not a mean one."

Now in power himself he set about reversing what he considered to have been the unimaginative, unpatriotic policy of his predecessors. His first conspicuous achievement in foreign affairs was the purchase of the Suez canal shares. The Suez canal had been built by the French against ill-concealed English opposition. Disraeli had himself declared that the undertaking would inevitably be a failure. Now that the canal was built its success was speedily apparent. It radically changed the conditions of commerce with the East. It shortened greatly the distance to the Orient by water. Hitherto a considerable part of the commerce with India, China, and Australia had been carried on by the long voyage around the Cape of Good Hope. Some went by the Red Sea route, but that involved transhipment at Alexandria. Now it could all pass through the canal. About three-fourths of the tonnage passing through the canal was English. It was the direct road to India. There were some 400,000 shares in the Canal Company. The Khedive of Egypt held a large block of these, and the Khedive was nearly bankrupt. Disraeli bought, in 1875, his 177,000 shares by telegraph for four million pounds, and the fact was announced to a people who had never dreamed of it, but who applauded what seemed a brilliant stroke, somehow checkmating the French. It was said that the high road to India was now secure. Financially it was an advantageous bargain. The shares are now worth more than seven times what was paid for them.[1] The political significance of this act was that it determined at least in principle the future of the relations of England to Egypt, and that it seemed to strike the note of imperial self-assertion which was Disraeli's chief ambition, and which was the most notable characteristic of his administration.

Purchase of the Suez Canal shares.

At the same time Disraeli resolved to emphasize the im-

[1] The exact number of shares acquired was 176,602; amount paid 3,976,582 pounds. England, therefore, paid about $112 per share (par value $100). The stock was quoted in 1909 at $790.

portance of India, England's leading colony, in another way. He proposed a new and sounding title for the British sovereign. She was to be Empress of India. The Opposition denounced this as "cheap" and "tawdry," a vulgar piece of pretension. Was not the title of King or Queen borne by the sovereigns of England for a thousand years glorious enough? But Disraeli urged it as showing "the unanimous determination of the people of the country to retain our connection with the Indian Empire. And it will be an answer to those mere economists and those diplomatists who announce that India is to us only a burden or a danger. By passing this bill then, the House will show, in a manner that is unmistakable, that they look upon India as one of the most precious possessions of the Crown, and their pride that it is a part of her empire and governed by her imperial throne."

The Queen proclaimed Empress of India.

The reasoning was weak, but the proposal gave immense satisfaction to the Queen, and it was enacted into law. On January 1, 1877, the Queen's assumption of the new title was officially announced in India before an assembly of the ruling princes.

In Europe Disraeli insisted upon carrying out a spirited foreign policy. His opportunity came with the reopening of the Eastern Question, or the question of the integrity of Turkey, in 1876. For two years this problem absorbed the interest and attention of rulers and diplomatists, and England had much to do with the outcome. This subject may, however, be better studied in connection with the general history of the Eastern problem in the nineteenth century.[1]

Reopening of the Eastern Question.

Disraeli, who in 1876 became Lord Beaconsfield, continued in power until 1880. The emphasis he put upon imperial and colonial problems was to exert a considerable influence upon the rising generation, and upon the later history of England. But it involved him in several undertakings,

[1] See Chapter XXVIII.

particularly wars in Afghanistan and South Africa, which did not prove successful, and which contributed to his overthrow and the temporary eclipse of his party. In the elections of 1880 the Liberals attacked the whole policy of the last six years with vehemence. The result of the elections was the return of a Liberal majority of over a hundred. In April 1880, Mr. Gladstone became prime minister for the second time.

Fall of the Disraeli Ministry.

The Second Gladstone Ministry, 1880-1885.

Mr. Gladstone's greatest ability lay in internal reform, as his previous ministry had shown. This was the field of his inclination, and, as he thought, of the national welfare. Peace, retrenchment, and reform, the watchwords of his party, now represented the programme he wished to follow. But this was not to be. While certain great measures of internal improvement were passed during the next five years, those years on the whole were characterized by the dominance of imperial and colonial questions, with attendant wars. Mr. Gladstone was forced to busy himself with foreign policy far more than in his preceding administration. Serious questions confronted him in Asia and Africa. These may best be studied, however, in the chapter on the British Empire.[1]

Two pieces of internal legislation of great importance enacted during this ministry merit description, the Irish Land Act of 1881, and the Reform Bills of 1884-5.

Failure of Land Act of 1870.

The legislation of his preceding ministry had not pacified Ireland. Indeed, the Land Act of 1870 had proved no final settlement, but a great disappointment. It had established the principle that the landlord's ownership in Ireland was not absolute and unrestricted but was a kind of limited partnership. The tenant was to be compensated if deprived of his farm except for non-payment of rent, and was to be compensated, in any case, for all the permanent improvements which he had made upon the land. But this was not sufficient to give the tenant any security in his holding. It

[1] Chapter XXII.

did not prevent the raising of the rent at the will of the landlord. The bill was not far-reaching enough adequately to safeguard the interests of the tenant; moreover, it contained too many exceptions and restrictions. The bill, in fact, proved no solution, but only the first of a long line of measures enacted since, aiming at the removal of the agrarian difficulties under which the island suffered.

The Land Act of 1881.

In his new measure Gladstone sought to give the peasant, in addition to the compensation for improvement previously secured, a fair rent, a fixed rent, one that is not constantly subject to change at the will of the landlord, and freedom of sale, that is, the liberty of the peasant to sell his holding to some other peasant. These were the "three F's," which had once represented the demands of advanced Irishmen, though they no longer did. Henceforth, the rent of an Irish farm was not to be fixed by the ordinary law of supply and demand, by an agreement between landlord and tenant, but was to be determined by a court, established for the purpose. It was hardly proper to call this "fair" rent. It might not necessarily be fair, as the Land Court might lean too much in favor of the landlord, or in favor of the peasant. It was, however, a *judicial* rent. Rents, once judicially determined, were to be unchangeable for fifteen years, during which time the tenant might not be evicted except for breaches of covenant, such as non-payment of rent. There was also attached to the bill a provision similar to the one in the preceding measure of 1870, looking toward the creation of a peasant proprietorship. The Government was to loan money to the peasants under certain conditions and on easy terms, to enable them to buy out the landlords, thus becoming complete owners themselves.

Rents to be judicially determined.

Denounced as confiscation of property.

The bill was attacked with unusual bitterness. Landowners, believing that it meant a reduction of rents, determined not by themselves but by a court, called it confiscation of property. "It is a bill," said the Duke of Argyll, "by which three persons are authorized to settle the value

of the whole country." It was attacked because it established the principle that rents were not to be determined, like the price of other things, by the law of supply and demand. Rents were not to be what the landlord might demand and the peasant agree to pay, but were to be reasonable, and their reasonableness was to be decided by outsiders, judges, having no direct interest at all, that is, in last resort, by the State. The bill was criticized as altering ruthlessly the nature of property in land, as establishing dual ownership. The only alternative, however, was the single ownership of the landlord, that is, his right to do as he liked with the land, the very thing which had, it was asserted, occasioned the many sufferings of Ireland, and the endless series of coercion acts by which it had been so long ruled arbitrarily. The bill passed. It did not pacify Ireland, which was now putting forth new demands of a political nature and was in the full swing of the Home Rule movement. It did not bring immediate but only ultimate improvement. Meanwhile disturbances, and even atrocious crimes, continued, evidences of the profound unrest of the unhappy island.

The Reform Bill of 1884.

It was Mr. Gladstone who carried through the third great reform act of the nineteenth century, by which England has been transformed from an oligarchy into a democracy. The Reform Bill of 1832 had given the suffrage to the wealthier members of the middle class. The Reform Bill of 1867 had taken a long step in the direction of democracy by giving the vote practically to all householders in boroughs. But those who lived, not in boroughs, but in the country, were not greatly profited by this measure. In England there are three classes of people who have to do with the land. First, the landlords, the owners of large estates. These men belonged to the nobility and gentry, and had controlled the House of Commons before 1832, when that house was called the landlords' Parliament. Second are the farmers, men who rent their farms from the land-

lords, and who conduct the agriculture of the country, but do not, as a rule, do the actual work of tilling the soil. These men were largely enfranchised by the Reform Bill of 1832. Third, there are the laborers, employed by the farmer to do his work, day laborers. Now the Act of 1867 did not give them the suffrage, though it did give it largely to the day laborers in the boroughs by establishing the household and lodger franchise, a franchise so low that many workingmen could meet it. The franchise in boroughs was much wider than the franchise in counties. There was apparently no valid reason for giving a vote to workingmen living in boroughs and not to those living in country villages or on farms. Mr. Gladstone's bill of 1884 aimed at the abolition of this inequality between the two classes of constituencies, by extending the borough franchise to the counties so that the mass of workingmen would have the right to vote whether they lived in town or country. The county franchise, previously higher, was to be exactly assimilated to the borough franchise. The bill passed, and in connection with bills enacted for Scotland and Ireland, doubled the number of county voters, and increased the total number of the electorate from over three to over five millions. Mr. Gladstone's chief argument was that the bill would lay the foundations of the government broad and deep in the people's will, and "array the people in one solid compacted mass around the ancient throne which it has loved so well, and around a constitution now to be more than ever powerful, and more than ever free."

The county franchise widened.

The franchise bill of 1884 was accompanied, as had been those of 1832 and 1867, by a redistribution of seats in the House of Commons. By the Redistribution Act of 1885 inequalities of representation of the same type as those rendered familiar in connection with the Reform Bill of 1832, inequalities which had grown up in the last generation, were redressed, and certain new principles were adopted. Towns containing fewer than 15,000 inhabitants were to

Redistribution of seats.

lose their separate representation and be merged in the counties in which they were situated. Towns whose population ranged between 15,000 and 50,000 were to return one member only. Such were the two disfranchising clauses. There were some exceptions, but the result of the whole was the extinction of 160 seats. These were distributed among the more populous boroughs and counties.

The Act of 1885 provided that henceforth boroughs with more than 15,000, and less than 50,000 inhabitants, should have one member; those with more than 50,000 and less than 165,000, two members; those with more than 165,000, three, with an additional member for every 50,000 inhabitants above that number. Thus London, in place of the previous 22 members, was to have 62, to which it was entitled if population was to be the basis. Liverpool was to have nine, Glasgow seven, and so on. The same was to hold with the counties. Yorkshire was to have 26 members, Lancashire 23. The result was that the great industrial centers, towns and counties, received representation approximate to their importance.

Single member districts.

The Redistribution Act of 1885 further applied in most cases the principle of single member divisions. Previously, if a borough had had two members it yet formed one constituency. All the voters had the right to vote for two members. Such boroughs were now divided into as many constituencies as they were allowed members. While previously some counties had been divided as being inconveniently large, no boroughs had been. The Act of 1885 applied the new principle to towns and counties alike, each constituency returning, with few exceptions, only one member. For instance, Liverpool, which had previously sent three members to Parliament, and which now was to send nine, was divided into nine distinct constituencies, each returning one member; Lancashire was now split into twenty-three divisions, with a single member from each.

The membership of the House of Commons was increased

at this time to 670, where it still remains. The number in 1815 was 658. This was not changed in 1832, nor in 1867, but after 1867 it had been reduced to 652 by the disfranchisement of several boroughs for corrupt practices.

Since 1885 there has been no new redistribution of seats, and the equality of districts, roughly worked out in 1885, has since disappeared in many cases. There is no periodical readjustment according to population, as in the United States after each census. To-day some electoral districts are ten, or even fifteen, times as large as others; many are two or three. Constituencies range from about 13,000 to over 217,000.

Since 1885 also there has been no extension of the suffrage. The evolution of the parliamentary franchise, which we have traced through the three great measures of 1832, 1867, and 1884, has progressed no further. It should not be forgotten that there is no single, uniform, universal qualification for voting. A man gets the right to vote by being able to meet one of several qualifications, and he may have several votes, if he satisfies the qualifications in different constituencies (plural voting). He may vote if he owns land of forty shillings annual value, if he holds land of the value of five pounds by a lease of sixty years, of fifty pounds by a lease of twenty years, if he is a householder, no matter what the value of the house is, if he is an "occupier" of a house or building or store, of the annual value of ten pounds, if he is a lodger of lodgings of the annual value, unfurnished, of ten pounds. Some enjoy the right under the provisions of the Act of 1884, some under those of the Act of 1867, some even under those of the Act of 1832. "The present condition of the franchise is indeed," says President Lowell, "historical rather than rational. It is complicated, uncertain, expensive in the machinery required, and excludes a certain number of people whom there is no reason for excluding, while it admits many people who ought not to be admitted, if any one is to be debarred. But the hardship or injustice affects individuals

Various qualifications for voting.

alone. No considerable class in the community is aggrieved, and neither political party is now anxious to extend the franchise. The Conservatives are not by tradition in favor of such a course, and leading Liberals have come to realize that any further extension would be likely to benefit their opponents." [1]

[1] Lowell, The Government of England, I, 213-14.

CHAPTER XXI

ENGLAND SINCE 1886

The Gladstone ministry fell from power in 1885 chiefly because of the unpopularity of its Egyptian policy, which will be described elsewhere. Lord Salisbury, since Lord Beaconsfield's death in 1881 leader of the Conservative party, formed a ministry. This lasted but a few months, for the general elections at the close of the year showed that the Liberals would have in the new Parliament 335 votes, the Conservatives 249, and the Irish Home Rulers 86. Thus the Liberals exactly equaled the other two parties combined. The Irish held the balance of power. It is necessary at this point to trace the history of this new party, which was destined to exert a profound influence upon the course of British politics.

The First Salisbury administration.

During Gladstone's first ministry there was formed in Dublin the Home Government Association of Ireland; three years later reconstituted as the Home Rule League, and demanding an Irish Parliament for the management of the internal affairs of Ireland. The Irish had constantly smarted under the injury which they felt had been done them by the abolition of their former Parliament, which sat in Dublin, and which was abolished by the Act of Union of 1800. The feeling for nationality, one of the dominant forces of the nineteenth century everywhere, acted upon them with unusual force. They disliked, for historical and sentimental reasons, the rule of an English Parliament, and the sense as well as reality of subjection to an alien people. They felt that England must give them rights of self-government or else must rule them by coercion. The party grew into importance under Disraeli's administration, hav-

The Home Rule Movement.

ing 51 members in Parliament, who supported the principle of Home Rule. Their leader at first was Mr. Butt, who brought their demands before the House of Commons. The party did not wish the separation of Ireland from England, but a separate parliament for Irish affairs, on the ground that the Parliament at Westminster had neither the time nor the understanding necessary for the proper consideration of measures affecting the Irish. It became much more aggressive when Charles Stuart Parnell became its leader in 1879. Parnell was a Protestant, of English education, a landowner. Unlike the other great leaders of Irish history—Grattan, O'Connell—he was no orator, and was of a cold and haughty nature, but of an inflexible will. For twelve years he played a great part in the politics of England and Ireland.

Charles Stuart Parnell.

Discontented with the slow, easy, ineffective methods of urging Home Rule hitherto followed, Parnell persuaded the party to adopt a more vigorous and defiant attitude. His policy was to keep the Home Rule party entirely separate from the other parties, and to use the modes of procedure of the House of Commons in order to block the work of the House; in other words, to resort to endless dilatory motions and roll-calls and speeches, in short, obstruction. The rules of the House rendered this possible, as every member could propose as many amendments as he chose to any bill, and could speak on those proposals as long as he chose. The policy was carried out by the Irish members relieving each other systematically. In 1879 it was estimated that Parnell had spoken five hundred times, and that two others had spoken over three hundred times each. The purpose of this recourse to such methods was to paralyze the action of Parliament until it gave heed to Irish demands, to prevent or delay all legislation on even the most necessary subjects until their grievances were redressed, and to show conclusively that one Parliament was insufficient for the business of both countries. The House was obliged to change

Adoption of the policy of obstruction.

its rules in order to prevent this blocking of public business by a small fraction of its members.

Gladstone unable to pacify Ireland.

In the Parliament of 1880 the Home Rulers numbered 63. Mr. Gladstone, still believing that land legislation would solve the Irish question, showed the intention of carrying further the policy begun in his first administration. He caused the Land Act of 1881 to be passed. But the Home Rulers all through his term pursued him even more vehemently than they had his predecessors. They accepted the bill as a mere instalment. But the first three years of Gladstone's second administration were years of unexampled bitterness. The Irish resorted to every means to get their object, intimidation, violence, mutilation of cattle, burning of houses, even the murder of landlords and some of the Government officials in Ireland, notably Lord Frederick Cavendish and Thomas Burke, shockingly assassinated in broad daylight in Phœnix Park, Dublin, in 1882. Gladstone replied by a policy of coercion. Conciliatory legislation and stern repression of violence were his principles of action. After 1883 the condition of Ireland became somewhat calmer, but only after a confused and bitter struggle, which had aroused all the hostile feelings of both the Irish and the English. The Irish, it was clear, were prepared to fight to the knife, were biding the time when they might force Home Rule from Parliament by holding the balance of power in the House of Commons. In the next Parliament, which met in 1886, they were in this position. They had 86 members, all but one of whom represented Irish constituencies.

The Third Gladstone ministry.

Mr. Gladstone entered upon his third ministry February 1, 1886. It lasted less than six months, and was wholly devoted to the question of Ireland.

It was evident that the Irish question would dominate Mr. Gladstone's third ministry, as it had dominated his first and largely his second. This would have been so even if the Home Rulers had not held the balance of power in the House of Commons. It would have dominated

the Conservatives had not the Liberals won in the general election. Mr. Gladstone had expressed during the campaign his desire that either one or the other of the two great English parties should have so large a majority that the vexatious question could be handled without the aid of Irish votes. There is, indeed, evidence to show that he was quite willing that the Conservatives should solve this question if they would only honestly face it. He wished to raise it out of the realm of party conflict. That was not to be, however, and the election had resulted in creating just the situation he had dreaded and deplored. The Irish held the balance of power, and any proposals he might make would now be represented as simply a bribe for political position. Such a consideration, however, he proudly ignored, and it had no hold upon serious politicians of either party, for his noble record for fifty years gave it emphatic denial. This was the situation as it presented itself to his mind. The Irish people had expressed their almost unanimous wish by returning a solid body of 85 Home Rulers out of the 103 members to whom they were entitled. Mr. Gladstone had tried in previous legislation to rule the Irish according to Irish rather than English ideas, where he considered those ideas just. He believed the great blot upon the annals of England to be the Irish chapter, written, as it had been, by English arrogance, hatred, and unintelligence. Reconciliation had been his keynote hitherto. Moreover, to him there seemed but two alternatives—either further reform along the lines desired by the Irish, or the old, sad story of hard yet unsuccessful coercion. Mr. Gladstone would have nothing more to do with the latter method. He, therefore, resolved to endeavor to give to Ireland the Home Rule she plainly desired. On the 8th of April, 1886, he introduced the Irish Government Bill, announcing that it would be followed by a Land Bill, the two parts of a single scheme which could not be separated.

The Home Rulers hold the balance of power

Home Rule or Coercion?

Introduction of the Home Rule Bill.

The bill, thus introduced, provided for an Irish Parlia-

ment to sit in Dublin, controlling a ministry of its own, and legislating on Irish, as distinguished from imperial affairs. A difficulty arose right here. If the Irish were to have a legislature of their own for their own affairs, ought they still to sit in the Parliament in London, with power there to mix in English and Scotch affairs? On the other hand, if they ceased to have members in London, they would have no share in legislating for the Empire as a whole. "This," says Morley, "was from the first, and has ever since remained, the Gordian knot." The bill provided that they should be excluded from the Parliament at Westminster. On certain topics it was further provided that the Irish Parliament should never legislate, questions affecting the Crown, the army and navy, foreign and colonial affairs; nor could it establish or endow any religion. After two years it was to have control of the Irish police. Ireland must contribute a certain proportion to the imperial expenses, one-fourteenth, instead of two-seventeenths, as had been the case since 1801.

Shall the Irish sit in Westminster?

Mr. Gladstone did not believe that the Irish difficulty would be solved simply by new political machinery. There was a serious social question not reached by this, the land question. He introduced immediately a land bill, which was to effect a vast transfer of land by purchase from landlords to peasants, and which might perhaps involve an expenditure to the State of about 120,000,000 pounds.

Land Purchase Bill.

The introduction of these bills, whose passage would mean a radical transformation of Ireland, precipitated one of the fiercest struggles in English parliamentary annals. They were urged as necessary to settle the question once for all on a solid basis, as adapted to bring peace and contentment to Ireland, and thus strengthen the Union. Otherwise, said those who supported them, England had no alternative but coercion, a dreary and dismal failure. On the other hand, the strongest opposition arose out of the belief that these bills imperiled the very existence of the

Opposition to the bills.

Union. The exclusion of the Irish members from Parliament seemed to many to be the snapping of the cords that held the countries together. Did not this bill really dismember the British Empire? Needless to say, no British statesman could urge any measure of that character. Gladstone thought that his bills meant the reconciliation of two peoples estranged for centuries, and that reconciliation meant the strengthening rather than the weakening of the Empire, that the historic policy of England towards Ireland had only resulted in alienation, hatred, the destruction of the spiritual harmony which is essential to real unity. But, said his opponents, to give the Irish a parliament of their own, and to exclude them from the Parliament in London, to give them control of their own legislature, their own executive, their own judiciary, their own police, must lead inevitably to separation. You exclude them from all participation in imperial affairs, thus rendering their patriotism the more intensely local. You provide, it is true, that they shall bear a part of the burdens of the Empire. Is this proviso worth the paper it is written on? Will they not next regard this as a grievance, this taxation without representation, and will not the old animosity break out anew? You abandon the Protestants of Ireland to the revenge of the Catholic majority of the new Parliament. To be sure, you provide for toleration in Ireland, but again is this toleration worth the paper it is written on?

The union in danger!

English dislike of the Irish.

Probably the strongest force in opposition to the bill was the opinion widely held in England of Irishmen, that they were thoroughly disloyal to the Empire, that they would delight to use their new autonomy to pay off old scores by aiding the enemies of England, that they were traitors in disguise, or undisguised, that they had no regard for property or contract, that an era of religious oppression and of confiscation of property would be inaugurated by this new agency of a parliament of their own. These feelings were expressed in characteristic ways by the leader of the Opposi-

tion, Lord Salisbury, and by Mr. Gladstone's close friend and previous political ally, John Bright. Lord Salisbury expressed all the contempt of an aristocrat belonging to a superior race. "Ireland, he declared, is not one nation, but two nations. There were races like the Hottentots, and even the Hindoos, incapable of self-government. He would not place confidence in people who had acquired the habit of using knives and slugs. His policy was that Parliament should enable the government of England to govern Ireland. 'Apply the recipe honestly, consistently, and resolutely for twenty years, and at the end of that time you will find that Ireland will be fit to accept any gifts in the way of local government or repeal of coercion laws that you may wish to give her.'" [1] He added that rather than spend the money in buying out the Irish landlords, it would be far better to spend it in assisting the emigration of a million Irishmen. Mr. Bright's opposition differed in temper, and was far more damaging in its effects. He had long been known as the friend of Ireland, as a disbeliever in the policy of coercion, as an advocate of measures adapted to relieve the discontent of the people. But he disliked intensely the idea of a second parliament in the United Kingdom, which he did not think would be successful or work harmoniously with the Parliament in London; he believed a new parliament would prove most oppressive to Irish Protestants; he spoke with extreme bitterness of the Irish party in Parliament, and its policy for the last six years; he did not believe these men either loyal or honorable or truthful, and he did believe that, if they obtained a Parliament of their own, they would use it against England.

John Bright's opposition.

Bitter personalities abounded in the debate. One member characterized the plan as the offspring of "verbosity and senility," as the "foolish work" of "an old man in a hurry." It was evident that the Home Rule Bill had aroused an amount of bitterness unknown in recent English history.

[1] Morley, Life of Gladstone, III, 317, 318.

Disruption of the Liberal Party

The Conservative party opposed it to a man. And the Liberal party was in full process of disruption because of it. Even before the measure was brought in, many men who had hitherto worked side by side with Mr. Gladstone in his previous ministries, withdrew and went over to the Conservatives. These men called themselves Liberal-Unionists, Liberals, but not men who were prepared to jeopardize the Union, as they held that this measure would do—Lord Hartington (later the Duke of Devonshire), Mr. Bright, Joseph Chamberlain, Mr. Goschen, and many others. All the journals of London, with the exception of one morning and one evening paper, were vigorously opposed. The crucial question was, how large the secession from the Liberal party would be? Would it be large enough to offset the Irish vote which would be cast for the measure? Finally a vote was taken on the 8th of June, on the second reading of the bill. It was found that 93 Liberals had joined the Opposition, and that the Home Rule Bill was beaten by 343 votes to 313. The total poll was thus enormous, 656 out of the 670 members of the House. Between one-third and one-fourth of the Liberal party had withdrawn from it on account of this fateful measure.

The bill defeated.

Mr. Gladstone dissolved Parliament and appealed to the people. The question was vehemently discussed before the voters. The result was disastrous to the Gladstonian Home Rulers. 191 Gladstonians and 85 Irish Home Rulers were returned, and 316 Conservatives and 78 Liberal-Unionists. Thus a majority of over a hundred was rolled up against Gladstone's policy. Taking England alone, the result was even more striking. There he had only 125 seats out of 455; in London only 11 out of 62. On the other hand, Scotland approved in the ratio of 3 to 2, Wales of 5 to 1. Mr. Gladstone did not consider that such a result settled the issue irrevocably.

The Conservatives returned to power.

Lord Salisbury had said that if Parliament would rule Ireland resolutely for twenty years, at the end of that time

she would be fit to accept any gifts in the line of local government or repeal of coercion acts that Parliament might see fit to give her. He was now prime minister, and in a position to put his opinion into force. Coercion more severe than that of previous years was the policy adopted by this ministry, largely under the direction of Mr. Arthur James Balfour, Chief Secretary for Ireland. That the measures followed were stringent was shown by a statement of Sir George Trevelyan that of the eighty-five Irish Nationalist members, one out of every seven was in prison, on his way to prison, or on his way out of prison. Needless to say, no reconciliation was to be effected by such methods. The exasperation of the Irish was only intensified. Nevertheless, the system steadily applied was successful at least in restoring quiet. In 1890 it was found possible to relax it somewhat.

The Second Salisbury Ministry, 1886-1892.

The policy of coercion.

But the policy of this ministry was not simply negative. The idea that buying out the landlords and enabling the peasants to become full owners of their farms would solve the agrarian question, and that the agrarian question was at the root of Irish discontent, was no discovery of a Conservative ministry. Clauses with this in view had been inserted in Gladstone's Land Acts of 1870 and 1881, and the Land Bill of 1886 was a gigantic measure designed to effect this on a grand scale. That measure, however, frightened the taxpayers by the amount of the expenditure involved, and, moreover, it necessarily fell with the Home Rule Bill, of which it was intended to be the companion piece. Gladstone's earlier acts had not had great effect, as the State had offered to advance only two-thirds of the purchase price. The present plan provided that the State should advance the whole of it, to be repaid by instalments until at the end of forty-nine years the peasant would have his land as an unencumbered freehold. Thirty-three million pounds were set aside for the purpose. The landlords were not required to sell, but the issue has proved them willing to

do so in a large number of cases. The Government buys the land, sells it to the peasant, who that instant becomes its legal owner, and who pays for it gradually. He actually pays less in this way each year than he formerly paid for rent, and in the end he has his holding unencumbered. This bill was passed in 1891, and in five years some 35,000 tenants were thus enabled to purchase their holdings under its provisions. The system was extended much further in later years, particularly by the Land Act of 1903. From 1903 to 1908 there were about 160,000 purchasers.

Land Purchase Act.

A most important piece of legislation carried by this ministry was the County Councils Act of 1888. This act rendered the county governments of England and Wales democratic. Those governments had previously been entirely unrepresentative in character. They had been mainly in the hands of the landlord class, members of which were appointed by the Queen as magistrates or justices of the peace. As such they met four times a year in quarter sessions, and there regulated county affairs, levying taxes, discharging certain judicial functions, regulating the liquor trade, and the building and repair of highways, and supervising the actions of the officials of smaller areas. County government was in the hands of an oligarchy. The new act placed it in the hands of all ratepayers, who were to elect county councils for a term of three years, which were to conduct the local administration, with the exception of granting liquor licenses, a function which was to remain in the hands of the justices of the peace. Thus county government was made democratic. As local self-government had been established in the boroughs in 1835, it was now established in the counties. This was one of the most important achievements of this ministry. In 1889 a similar bill was passed for Scotland. Ireland lay outside this legislation.

County government reformed.

This ministry passed other bills of a distinctly liberal character; among them an act absolutely prohibiting the employment of children under ten, an act designed to reduce the

oppression of the sweat-shop by limiting the labor of women to twelve hours a day, with an hour and a half for meals, an act making education free, and a small allotment act intended to create a class of peasant proprietors in England. These measures were supported by all parties. They were important as indicating that social legislation was likely to be in the coming years more important than political legislation, which has proved to be the case. They also show that the Conservative party was changing in character, and was willing to assume a leading part in social reform. **Social legislation.**

In respect to another item of internal policy, the Salisbury ministry took a stand which has been decisive ever since. In 1889 it secured an immense increase of the navy. Seventy ships were to be added at an expense of 21,500,000 pounds during the next seven years. Lord Salisbury laid it down as a principle that the British navy ought to be equal to any other two navies of the world combined. **Increase of the navy.**

In foreign affairs the most important work of this ministry lay in its share in the partition of Africa, which will be described elsewhere.

The general elections of 1892 resulted in the return to power of the Liberals, supported by the Irish Home Rulers, and Mr. Gladstone, at the age of eighty-two, became for the fourth time prime minister, a record unparalleled in English history. As he himself said, the one single tie that still bound him to public life was his interest in securing Home Rule for Ireland before his end. It followed necessarily from the nature of the case that public attention was immediately concentrated anew on that question. Early in 1893 Mr. Gladstone introduced his second Home Rule Bill. Again the crucial difficulty was found to be that of the retention or non-retention of Irish representatives in the Parliament in London. There were three possible methods—total exclusion, inclusion for all purposes, or inclusion for certain specified purposes. The **The Fourth Gladstone Ministry, 1892-1894.** **The second Home Rule Bill.**

bill of 1886 was based on the first (with slight exceptions), and immediately the cry had been raised, and had been most effective, that the unity of the kingdom was threatened. In the new bill the third method was adopted. It was provided that Ireland should send eighty members to Westminster, but that they were not to vote on questions expressly confined to England and Scotland, on taxes which were not to be levied in Ireland, or on appropriations for other than imperial concerns.[1]

On this point the debate raged for a whole week. Mr. Gladstone was forced to change ground completely, and to propose the unconditional admission of the Irish members to the Parliament in London, with right to vote on all matters. Exclusion, as in 1886; partial inclusion as proposed in 1893; total inclusion as finally accepted by the ministry, these were the three possible ways of treating this crucial question. On this fundamental matter Lord Morley has written as follows: "Each of the three courses was open to at least one single, but very direct objection. Exclusion, along with the exaction of revenue from Ireland by the Parliament at Westminster, was taxation without representation. Inclusion for all purposes was to allow the Irish to meddle in our affairs, while we were no longer to meddle in theirs. Inclusion for limited purposes still left them invested with the power of turning out a British government by a vote against it on an imperial question. Each plan, therefore, ended in a paradox. There was a fourth paradox, namely, that whenever the British supporters of a government did not suffice to build up a decisive majority, then the Irish vote, descending into one or other scale of parliamentary balance, might decide who should be our rulers. This paradox—the most glaring of them all—habit and custom have made familiar." [2]

Fundamental objections.

[1] The bill of 1893 provided for two chambers in the Irish parliament; the bill of 1886 had provided for one chamber.

[2] Morley, Gladstone, III, 498.

Bitterness of the Opposition.

The opposition to the bill was exceedingly bitter and prolonged. Very few new arguments were brought forward on either side. Party spirit ran riot. Mr. Chamberlain was called Judas, and he in turn called Gladstone Herod. Lord Salisbury called the proposal "an intolerable, an imbecile, an accursed bill." Lord Randolph Churchill declared that the Irish leaders were "political brigands and nihilists," and that the ministry was "as capricious as a woman, and as impulsive and as passionate as a horde of barbarians."

Mr. Gladstone, who, incidentally, kept his temper, expressed with all his eloquence his faith in the Irish people, his belief that the only alternative to his policy was coercion, and that coercion would be forever unsuccessful, his conviction that it was the duty of England to atone for six centuries of misrule.

Passed by the Commons, defeated by the Lords.

After eighty-two days of discussion, marked by scenes of great disorder, members on one occasion coming to blows to the great damage of decorous parliamentary traditions, the bill was carried by a majority of 34 (301 to 267). A week later it was defeated in the House of Lords by 419 to 41, or a majority of more than ten to one. The bill was dead.

Gladstone attempted to carry through various English measures, but here again he was foiled by the hereditary chamber. A single legislative reform was enacted, the Parish Councils Bill of 1894. This established in every parish of more than 300 inhabitants a council elected by the taxpayers, and gave them certain powers of self-government. This was the natural supplement to the County Councils Act of 1888, completing the process of constitutional reform which began in 1832. Agricultural laborers were henceforth to have a political training in participating in the management of local affairs.

Parish Councils Bill.

Mr. Gladstone's fourth ministry was balked successfully at every turn by the House of Lords, which, under the able leadership of Lord Salisbury, recovered an actual power

Resignation of Gladstone.

it had not possessed since 1832. In 1894 Mr. Gladstone resigned his office, thus bringing to a close one of the most remarkable political careers known to English history. His last speech in Parliament was a vigorous attack upon the House of Lords. In his opinion, that House had become the great obstacle to progress. "The issue which is raised between a deliberative assembly, elected by the votes of more than 6,000,000 people," and an hereditary body, "is a controversy which, when once raised, must go forward to an issue." This speech was his last in an assembly where his first had been delivered sixty-one years before. Gladstone died four years later, and was buried in Westminster Abbey (1898).

The Rosebery Ministry.

He was succeeded in the premiership by Lord Rosebery, whose ministry lasted only sixteen months. The withdrawal of Gladstone showed the many rifts in the Liberal party, which a leader of less prestige and less commanding personality could not close. The party was discouraged by its failure to achieve Home Rule, was balked by the House of Lords, was divided into groups desiring various things, and was feebly supported by the people. Such a ministry could not long endure. Rosebery alienated the Irish by declaring that he agreed with Lord Salisbury, that before Home Rule should be granted Ireland, "England, as the predominant member of the partnership of the three kingdoms, will have to be convinced of its justice."

The Rosebery ministry accomplished very little. Its campaign against the House of Lords was half-hearted and ineffective. In one sphere, where the Lords were by custom forbidden to interfere in financial matters, it made an important change. England was now involved in the widespread militaristic movement, which is one of the striking features of the closing nineteenth century. In England it took the form of very largely increasing the navy, and the principle was now being accepted which has since become an axiom in British policy, of making the British fleet the

equal of any two foreign fleets combined. This involved much larger taxation. In the budget of 1894, the work of Sir William Vernon Harcourt, the principle of graduation was introduced into the inheritance taxes. The tax imposed by the state was to vary from one per cent. on estates of five hundred pounds to eight per cent. on estates of over a million pounds. This change was bitterly resented by the wealthy.

The Conservatives returned to power.

In June 1895 the Rosebery ministry was defeated on a minor matter and seized the occasion to resign. Lord Salisbury became prime minister. A general election was at once held, which proved to be a crushing defeat for the Liberals. The Conservatives and the Liberal-Unionists, or the Unionist party, as it was generally called, so thorough had become the amalgamation of the two, had a majority in the new Parliament of about a hundred and fifty, a larger majority than any party had had in any parliament since the one chosen immediately after the Reform Bill of 1832. This party was to remain uninterruptedly in power until December 1905.

The Third Salisbury Ministry.

Lord Salisbury was now prime minister for the third time. He remained such until 1902, when he withdrew from public life, being succeeded by his nephew, Mr. Arthur James Balfour. There was, however, no change of party. Lord Salisbury had an immense majority in the House of Commons. His ministry contained several very able men. He himself assumed the Foreign Office, Mr. Chamberlain the Colonial Office, Mr. Balfour the leadership of the House of Commons. The withdrawal of Mr. Gladstone and the divisions in the Liberal party reduced that party to a position of ineffective opposition. The Irish question sank into the background. Much social and labor legislation was enacted. The commanding question of this period was to be that of imperialism, and the central figure was Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, a man remarkable for vigor and audacity, and the most popular member of the cabinet.

Chamberlain, who had made his reputation as an advanced Liberal, an advocate of radical social and economic reforms, now stood forth as the spokesman of imperialism. His office, that of Colonial Secretary, gave him excellent opportunities to emphasize the importance of the colonies to the mother country, the desirability of drawing them closer together, of promoting imperial federation.

War in South Africa.

A period of great activity in foreign and colonial affairs began almost immediately after the inauguration of the new ministry. The most important chapter in this activity concerned the conditions in South Africa, which led, in 1899, to the Boer War, and which had important consequences. This will better be described elsewhere.[1]

The Conservatives, resolutely opposed to the policy of an independent parliament in Ireland, and conscious that in this they had the support of the people, declined absolutely to consider Home Rule. But they proposed to "kill Home Rule by kindness," as the phrase ran. Rigorous coercion for the suppression of disorder was united with a Land Purchase Bill, of the now familiar type, aiming to facilitate, more than previous bills had done, the buying out of the landlords and the creation of a peasant proprietorship of the soil of Ireland (1896). More important was the Irish Local Government Act of 1898, which aimed to give some measure of local self-government to the Irish by establishing there, as had been done in England, county councils and district councils, but not parish councils. These bodies, which were to possess considerable powers in the management of local affairs, were to be elected on a franchise identical with the parliamentary franchise, except that Peers and women might vote. This was, of course, no substitute for Home Rule, nor was it intended to be.

Irish Local Government Act.

The South African war, from 1899 to 1902, absorbed the attention of England until its successful termination. Internal legislation was of slight importance. During the

[1] Pages 541-544.

war Queen Victoria died, January 22, 1901, after a reign of over sixty-three years, the longest known in British history, and only exceeded elsewhere by the seventy-one years' reign of Louis XIV of France. She had proved during her entire reign, which began in 1837, a model constitutional monarch, subordinating her will to that of the people, as expressed by the ministry and Parliament. "She passed away," said Mr. Balfour in the House of Commons, "without an enemy in the world, for even those who loved not England loved her." The reign of Edward VII, then in his sixty-second year, began.

Death of Queen Victoria.

A very important measure passed by this Conservative ministry was the Education Act of 1902. The Forster Act of 1870, which had remained the basis of the elementary educational system of England since its passage, had adopted the voluntary or denominational schools, and had added, where these were not adequate, board schools. Both were to receive generally fees from their pupils and grants from Parliament. In addition, the voluntary schools were to receive voluntary gifts as hitherto, and the board schools local taxes levied for the purpose by the boards. As the years went by, the voluntary schools found that they were being handicapped by the fact that the board schools had larger financial resources than they. The parliamentary grants were conditioned in amount by the sums raised in the other ways by the two kinds of schools. Now the board schools could, by raising more from taxation, earn larger grants from Parliament, while the voluntary schools, relying upon private subscriptions, could not gain increased appropriations unless they could get larger subscriptions. While they were able to do this for a while, they were not able to in the long run. In 1900 the average amount per pupil was somewhat less than thirty years before. They were thus at a disadvantage compared with the board schools. The voluntary schools, which were for the most part connected with the Church of England, began

Education Act of 1902.

to demand further help from Parliament. In 1897 the were given an additional subsidy, which, in their opinion was not large enough. Their agitation continued and re sulted finally in the passage of the Act of 1902.

Abolition of the School Boards.

By this the school boards, established in 1870, were abo ished, and their powers were vested in the county an borough councils, that is, in the regular local governmen bodies. These were to support both sets of schools, th former board and the voluntary, out of local taxes, parlia mentary grants continuing. In other words, local taxe were to be raised for denominational schools, as well as fo undenominational, parliamentary grants, as hitherto, als going to both. The actual management of the former boar schools was to be in the hands of a committee of the count or borough council. That of the church schools was t be in the hands of a committee of six, two of whom were t represent the county or borough council, while four wer to represent the denomination. In other words, people wer to be taxed for both sets of schools, but were to control onl one. The bill gave great offense to Dissenters and be lievers in secular education. It authorized taxation for th advantage of a denomination of which multitudes of tax payers were not members. It was held to be a measur for increasing the power of the Church of England. Th conscience clause was applied to all schools, as hitherto.

The opposition to this law was intense. Thousands re fused to pay their taxes, and their property was, therefore sold by public authority to meet the taxes. Many wer imprisoned. There were over 70,000 summonses to court The agitation thus aroused was one of the great cause for the crushing defeat of the Conservative party in 1905 Yet the law of 1902 was put into force and is at thi moment the law of England, the Liberals having faile in 1906 in an attempt to pass an education bill of thei own to supersede it. The educational system remains on of the contentious problems of English politics. Mean

while, under the operation of the laws passed in review, illiteracy, very general in the middle of the nineteenth century, has almost entirely disappeared. In 1843, 32 per cent. of the men, 49 per cent. of the women, were illiterate, whereas in 1903 only two per cent. of the former and three of the latter were in this condition. **Decline of illiteracy.**

Since December 1905 the Liberal party has been in power, first under the premiership of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, and, since his death early in 1908, under that of Mr. Herbert Asquith. This party won in the General Elections of 1906 (January and February) the largest majority ever obtained since 1832. The most important achievement of this administration thus far has been the passage in 1908 of the Old Age Pensions Act, which marks a long step forward in the extension of state activity. It grants, under certain slight restrictions, pensions to all persons of a certain age and of a small income. Denounced as paternalistic, as socialistic, as sure to undermine the thrift and the sense of responsibility of the laborers of Great Britain, it was urged as a reasonable and proper recognition of the value of the services to the country of the working classes, services as truly to be rewarded as those of army and navy and administration. The act provides that those whose income does not exceed twenty-five guineas a year shall receive a weekly pension of five shillings, that those with larger incomes shall receive proportionately smaller amounts, down to the minimum of one shilling a week. Those whose income exceeds thirty guineas and ten shillings a year receive no pensions. Such pensions are granted only to British subjects, who have resided in Great Britain for twenty years, who are at least seventy years of age, and are not in receipt of poor relief. It was estimated by the prime minister that the initial burden to the state would be about seven and a half million pounds, an amount that would necessarily increase in later years. The post office is used as the distributing agent. This law went into force **The Liberal party in power.** **Old Age Pensions Law.**

on January 1, 1909. On that day over half a million me and women went to the nearest post office and drew the first pensions of from one to five shillings, and on ever Friday henceforth as long as they live they may do th same. It was noticed that these men and women accepte their pensions not as a form of charity or poor relief, bu as an honorable reward. The statistics of those claimin under this law are instructive and sobering. In the count of London one person in every one hundred and seventee was a claimant; in England and Wales one in eighty-six in Scotland one in sixty-seven; in Ireland one in twenty-on

An Irish university.

Another act passed by this administration was that estal lishing an Irish university, which Catholics would feel fr to attend. Thus was solved in 1908 a problem which Glac stone had attempted to solve in 1873, but without succes The Birrell Act really establishes two universities—one i Belfast, consisting of the former Queen's College in tha city, this for Protestants; and one for Catholics, t have its seat in Dublin, and to possess three colleges, on in Cork, one in Galway, and a new college in Dublin. Eac college will, in reality, be an almost independent universit practically, though not nominally, controlling appointment the function of the university body being that of co-ordina tion and supervision only. No chapel is to be erecte on the grounds of any college. No professorships of the ology may be created out of public moneys. Such ma be created by private gifts, but their occupants may no sit with the other professors on academic boards.

The present ministry has made repeated efforts to alte the elementary educational system, based on the law o 1902, but has been blocked by the House of Lords. Tha law is, therefore, still in force.

Questions of suffrage are becoming increasingly prom nent, and are apparently verging toward a further enlarg ment of the electorate. In recent years the demand fo woman suffrage has been pressed with great vigor and co

fidence. Women already possess the franchise for most local elections, but cannot yet vote for members of Parliament. For twenty years plural voting has been denounced by the Liberals, who desire to restrict each voter to a single vote. In 1906 the House of Commons passed a bill abolishing this inequality. It was thrown out promptly by the House of Lords. It is likely that some comprehensive reform, accompanied by a redistribution of seats, will be effected in the near future.

CHAPTER XXII

THE BRITISH EMPIRE IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

The expansion of Europe.

We have thus far concerned ourselves with the history of the European continent. But one of the most remarkable features of the nineteenth century was the reaching out of Europe for the conquest of the world, and the opening of the present century sees the process far advanced. What is known as European civilization is in its characteristic features becoming the civilization of all countries and continents. The age of world politics, of world commerce, has come; the age of a common world culture appears likely ultimately to prevail. This extraordinary transformation is being effected by a variety of agencies, by the building up of great colonial empires, by conscious and resolute imitation of Europe on the part of countries like Japan and, very recently, by China, India, and Persia; by the elaboration of a marvelous economic life, each decade making enormous strides, of which every nation and country are necessary parts, bound securely together in the mesh of reciprocal needs and advantages. Peoples may no longer live in splendid or inglorious isolation, even if they wish to. European nations dominate directly immense regions of the world outside of Europe, having taken their destinies in charge. European civilization is acting as a powerful dissolvent of other inferior or less complex civilizations. The nineteenth century was not only a century of nation building, as we have seen, but of empire building on a colossal scale. A movement so vast in its sweep, so varied in its manifestations, so momentous in its inevitable con-

The growth of colonial empires.

sequences, merits careful study. Of the forces furthering this evolution undoubtedly the most important is the British Empire.

At the close of the eighteenth century England possessed in the new world, Upper and Lower Canada, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, and a large vague region known as the Hudson Bay territory; Jamaica, and other West Indian islands; in Australia, a strip of the eastern coast; in India, the Bengal or lower Ganges region, Bombay, and strips along the eastern and western coasts. The most important feature of her colonial policy had been her elimination of France as a rival, from whom she had taken in the Seven Years' War almost all of her North American and East Indian possessions. This Empire she increased during the Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars, largely at the expense of France and Holland, the ally of France. Thus she acquired the Cape of Good Hope, Guiana in South America, Tobago, Trinidad, and St. Lucia, Mauritius in the Pacific, and the large island of Ceylon. In the Mediterranean she acquired Malta. She also obtained Heligoland, and the protectorate of the Ionian Islands.

Vast growth of the British Empire since 1815.

Since 1815 her Empire has been vastly augmented by a long series of wars, and by the natural advance of her colonists over countries contiguous to the early settlements, as in Canada and Australia. Her Empire lies in every quarter of the globe.

INDIA

The acquisition of India, a world in itself, for the British crown was the work of a private commercial organization, the East India Company, which was founded in the sixteenth century and given a monopoly of the trade with India. This company established trading stations in various parts of that peninsula. Coming into conflict with the French, and mixing in the quarrels of the native princes, it succeeded in winning direct control of large sections, and

indirect control of others by assuming protectorates over certain of the princes, who allied themselves with the English and were left on their thrones. This commercial company became invested with the government of these acquisitions, under the provisions of laws passed by the English Parliament at various times. In the nineteenth century the area of British control steadily widened, until it became complete.

Overthrow of the Mahratta confederacy.

Its progress was immensely furthered by the overthrow, after a long and intermittent war, of the Mahratta confederacy, a loose union of Indian princes dominating central and western India. This confederacy was finally conquered in a war which lasted from 1816 to 1818, when a large part of its territories were added directly to the English possessions, and other parts were left under their native rulers who, however, were brought effectively under English control by being obliged to conform to English policy, to accept English *Residents* at their courts, whose advice they were practically compelled to follow, and by putting their native armies under British direction. Such is the condition of many of them at the present day.

Annexation of the Punjab.

The English also advanced to the north and northwest, from Bengal. One of their most important annexations was that of the Punjab, an immense territory on the Indus, taken as a result of two difficult wars (1845 to 1849), and the Oudh province, one of the richest sections of India, lying between the Punjab and Bengal, annexed in 1856.

The steady march of English conquest aroused a bitter feeling of hostility to the English, which came to a head in the famous Sepoy Mutiny of 1857, which for a time threatened the complete overthrow of the British in northern India. There were various causes of this insurrection: the bitter discontent of the deposed princes and their adherents, who sent out emissaries to stir up hatred against the intruders; the fear of other princes that their turn might come; the introduction of railways and telegraphs, represented by the priests as an attack upon their religion; rumors that the

English intended to force Christianity upon the people and destroy their religion and civilization; the attempts to stamp out the custom of female infanticide; a prophecy of the soothsayers that English domination was destined to end on the hundredth anniversary of its beginning at the battle of Plassey (1757).

The Indian Mutiny.

English domination rested on military force, and in the main upon the native Indian soldiers. There were in India in 1857 about 45,000 English troops, and over 250,000 native soldiers, the Sepoys. In that year a mutiny broke out among the Sepoys of the Ganges provinces in northern India. The immediate occasion was the introduction of a new rifle, or rather of the paper-covered cartridges for it, which were lubricated, it was alleged, with the fat of cows and pigs. One end of the cartridges had to be bitten by the teeth before being put into the barrel. This outraged the religious feelings of the Hindus, who regarded the cow as a sacred animal, and of the Mohammedans, who regarded the pig as unclean, the lard as contaminating. The English tried to dispel the rumor by publishing a formula of the grease used, and ordering officers to assure the soldiers that these ingredients were not employed, but their efforts were unavailing. A cavalry regiment refused to receive the new munitions, some of its members were sentenced to ten years' imprisonment, their comrades began an insurrection to save them, and the insurrection spread swiftly. The native soldiery seized Delhi, the ancient capital of the Moguls, Lucknow, Cawnpore, and other places, massacring with barbarous cruelty large numbers of men, women, and children. Shortly all northern India seemed lost.

The English took a fearful and decisive revenge. Many of the Sepoys remained loyal, European troops were rushed to the scene of the disturbance, and the insurrection was crushed. Beside themselves with rage and terrified by the narrowness of the escape, the English meted out ferocious punishment. Hundreds were shot in cold blood, without trial,

and thousands were hanged after trials that were a travesty of justice. Many were fastened to the mouths of cannon and blown to pieces.

Change in the government of India.

Since this mutiny fifty years ago no attempts have been made to overthrow English control. One important consequence was that in 1858 the government of India was transferred to the Crown from the private company which had conducted it for a century. It passed under the direct authority of England. In 1876, as we have seen, India was declared an empire, and Queen Victoria assumed the title Empress of India, January 1, 1877. This fact was officially announced in India by Lord Lytton, the Viceroy, to an imposing assembly of the ruling princes.

The vast population of India.

An empire it surely is, with its three hundred million inhabitants. A Viceroy stands at the head of the government. There is a Secretary for India in the British Ministry. The government is largely carried on by the highly organized Civil Service of India, and is in the hands of about eleven hundred Englishmen. About 220 millions of people are under the direct control of Great Britain; about 67 millions live in native states under native rulers, the "Protected Princes of India," of whom there were, a few years ago, nearly seven hundred. For all practical purposes, however, these princes must follow the advice of English officials, or Residents, stationed in their capitals.

The population not homogenous.

"The people of India," says President Lowell, "are not a nation, but a conglomerate of many different races and religions, often side by side in the same place, yet unmixed and sharply separate. It is this, as Seeley pointed out in his 'Expansion of England,' that has enabled the British to conquer and hold the country. If the inhabitants could act together, and were agreed in wanting independence, they could get it. In short, if they were capable of national self-government, the English would live on a volcano, and their occupation would be brief. The Mutiny was suppressed because it was not universal. The Sikhs helped to put down

the Sepoys; and so long as large sections of the people distrust one another more than they do the English, disaffection has little chance of achieving any notable result." [1]

Annexation of Burma and Baluchistan.

Not only has England completed her control of India in the nineteenth century, but she has added countries round about India, Burma toward the east, and, toward the west, Baluchistan, a part of which has been annexed outright, and the remainder brought under a protectorate. She has also imposed a kind of protectorate upon Afghanistan, as a result of two Afghan wars (1839-42 and 1878-80).

BRITISH NORTH AMERICA

In 1815, as already stated, Great Britain possessed, on the continent of North America, six colonies: Upper Canada, Lower Canada, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and Newfoundland; and the Hudson Bay Company's territories stretched to the north and northwest with undefined boundaries. The total population of these colonies was about 460,000. The colonies were entirely separate from each other. Each had its own government, and its relations were not with the others, but with England. The oldest and most populous was Lower Canada, which included Montreal and Quebec and the St. Lawrence valley. It was the French colony conquered by England in 1763. Its population was French-speaking, and Roman Catholic in religion.

Upper and Lower Canada.

The two most important of these colonies were Lower Canada, largely French, and Upper Canada, entirely English. Each had received a constitution in 1791, modeled along lines familiar to Englishmen at home. There was a Governor appointed by the monarch, an Executive Council, appointed by the same authority and corresponding to the cabinet, a Legislative Council, likewise appointed by the Crown and for life, intended as the nearest approach to the House of Lords possible in a frontier country, and a House of Assembly, the members of which were elected by the people.

[1] Lowell, The Government of England, II, 424-425.

Constitutional difficulties in Upper Canada.

Neither in Upper nor in Lower Canada did the constitution work well. In Upper Canada there were perpetual conflicts between the two Houses on the one hand, and the Governor on the other. The Governor could virtually veto the actions of the legislature, and considered himself responsible primarily to the English Government, not to the people of the province. He consulted the Executive Council only infrequently, and followed its opinion only when he chose to. What the two Houses were constantly struggling for was the creation of an executive, responsible, not to the monarch in England, but to themselves, and to this end they wished to make the Executive Council resemble the ministry in England. This struggle between executive and legislature was the fundamental problem in this province, which had, however, other grievances, such as the practical monopoly in office-holding which a few families had succeeded in acquiring.

In Lower Canada.

In Lower or French Canada there was also a constitutional struggle, embittered by race animosity. The French, overwhelmingly predominant in population, controlled only the House of Assembly, while the three other branches of the Government, the Governor, Executive Council, and Legislative Council, all appointive and not elective, were controlled by the English element. The chief struggle in this colony was between the Assembly, controlled by the French, and the Legislative Council, controlled by the English. The French demanded that the Legislative Council be made elective, expecting, if that were done, to have the majority in it. They demanded also that the executive, with the exception of the Governor, be made responsible to the legislature. The French, unable to get control of any branch of the government except the Assembly, resolved to use this to force the concessions they desired. They refused to make the appropriations necessary for the running of the government. Year after year, from 1832 on, no moneys were voted for the payment of judges and civil officers. The

struggle was similar to that witnessed in the eighteenth century in many of the thirteen colonies to the south.

The colonists desire self-government.

The conflict was between the representative and the non-representative parts of the government. It was fundamentally a constitutional question. The colonies did not possess complete legislative power, as the upper chamber, non-elective, could block the lower chamber, representing the people. Nor had the legislature, as a whole, what it had in England—control over the executive. "The colonies have the mockeries, the shadows of English institutions, not the realities; the names, not the substances," said Lord Durham later. The principle which makes the English system of government workable, responsibility of the executive to the legislature, was lacking. The people had no efficient control of their rulers. England had not yet solved the problem of colonial government.

The rebellion of 1837.

In 1837 disaffection had reached such a point that revolutionary movements broke out in both colonies. These were easily suppressed by the Canadian authorities without help from England, but the grievances of the colonists still remained.

The Durham Mission.

The English Government, thoroughly alarmed at the danger of the loss of another empire, adopted the part of discretion and sent out to Canada a commissioner to study the grievances of the colonists. The man chosen was Lord Durham, whose part in the reform of 1832 had been brilliant. Durham was in Canada five months. His acts were vehemently criticised in Parliament, the ministry, which had appealed to him to undertake the mission, did not loyally support him, and he shortly returned to England, humiliated and in official disgrace, the victim of the party and personal politics of England. He had "marred a career, but made a nation." The Durham Report, submitted to Parliament on his return, entitles him to the rank of the greatest colonial statesman in British history. It contained a full description of the situation in Canada, and proposed sweeping changes in colonial policy.

Lord Durham's Report.

Examining the history of the six provinces, Lord Durham declared "that the natural state of government in all these colonies is that of collision between the executive and the representative body." He pointed out that the executive was irresponsible, and asked how long Englishmen at home would tolerate a ministry not in sympathy with the majority of the House of Commons. Such ministries were the common occurrence in Canada. "It is difficult," he declared, "to understand how any English statesman could have imagined that representative and irresponsible government could be successfully combined." He also declared that the situation in Canada "was the unavoidable result of a system which stinted the popular branch of the legislature of the necessary privileges of a representative body." The Assembly in Lower Canada had been conducting "a constant warfare with the executive, for the purpose of obtaining the powers inherent in a representative body by the very nature of representative government."

The executive irresponsible.

Fox had said that "the only method of retaining distant colonies with advantage, is to enable them to govern themselves." This was what Lord Durham now proposed, namely, the introduction of complete ministerial responsibility to the popular chamber. "The Crown must consent to carry on the government by means of those in whom the representative members have confidence." "That sounds like a truism now," says Lord Durham's biographer, "but it was the first recognition by a responsible statesman of the principle of self-government in the colonies."[1]

Durham proposes ministerial responsibility.

No wonder then that this Report has been called "the Magna Charta of the Colonies," the "most valuable document in the English language on the subject of colonial policy," the "text book of every advocate of colonial freedom in all parts of the globe," that it is asserted to have "broadened once for all the lines of constructive statesmanship in all that relates to the colonial policy of England."

[1] Reid, Life and Letters of Lord Durham, II, 314.

Lord Durham believed also in a federal union of all the British colonies of North America but, recognizing that the idea was premature, he recommended the union of Upper and Lower Canada into a single colony with a single government. This he also thought would have the advantage of putting the English, the more progressive element, in a majority in the united colony.

Durham favors federation.

Durham's recommendations were not immediately followed as they seemed to many Englishmen to render the colonies independent. In 1840, however, a bill was passed carrying out the latter suggestion of a fusion of Ontario and Quebec, Upper and Lower Canada, under a single government, the Assembly to have larger powers than previously. But the essential feature of Durham's report, ministerial responsibility, was not provided for in the law, and, as a matter of fact, during the next seven years the Governors did not act upon the principle that the Executive Council was to do as the majority of the Assembly wished. This vital and, as far as the colonies were concerned, revolutionary principle was adopted in 1847 by Lord Elgin, the Governor of Canada and the son-in-law of Lord Durham, who chose as members of the Executive Council members of the French party then in majority in the Assembly, an act very unpopular with the English, and leading to a riot in which the mob attacked the Governor's carriage and set fire to the Parliament building. Elgin adhered to his resolution, however, and the principle of ministerial responsibility was thus introduced, and has since been constantly maintained. It was custom, however, not law. It spread rapidly to the other colonies of Great Britain, which were chiefly of English stock and were therefore considered capable of self-government. Responsible government was granted to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick in 1848, to Prince Edward Island in 1851, to New Zealand in 1854, and within the next two years to New South Wales, Victoria, Tasmania, South Australia, and Newfoundland; to Queensland in 1859; to British Co-

Ministerial responsibility finally introduced.

lumbia in 1871; to Cape Colony in 1872; to Western Australia in 1890, and Natal in 1893; to Transvaal Colony in 1906, and Orange River Colony in 1907.

DOMINION OF CANADA

The Act of 1840, based largely upon Durham's Report, had united Upper and Lower Canada, or Ontario and Quebec, into one colony, had swept away the two legislatures and established a single one for the united colony. This union of two colonies so very dissimilar, the one English, the other largely French, did not work smoothly, and there was a strong feeling that each part should have a legislature of its own for purely local purposes.

Founding of Dominion of Canada, 1867.

Lord Durham had also suggested federation of all the North American colonies as a final settlement. Various reasons prevented this for many years, among others the very defective means of communication, but the desire for federation gradually increased.

The growth of population, the improvement of ways of communication by the building of railroads, the example of the successful federation across the border to the south, and the possible danger of attack from that side, as suggested by the Fenian movement and the *Alabama* contentions, all caused Canadian public opinion to express itself in favor of union. The English Parliament was therefore merely voicing Canadian sentiment when in 1867 it passed the British North America Act. Indeed, that act had been drawn up in Canada and was ratified by the English Parliament without change. By it Upper and Lower Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick were joined into a confederation called the Dominion of Canada. There was to be a central or federal parliament sitting in Ottawa. There were also to be local or provincial legislatures in each province to legislate for local affairs. Questions affecting the whole Dominion were reserved for the Dominion Parliament.

British North America Act.

The central or Dominion Parliament was to consist of a

Senate and a House of Commons. The Senate was to be composed of seventy members nominated for life by the Governor-General, himself appointed by the monarch, and representing the Crown. The House of Commons was to be elected by the people. In some respects the example of the English Government was followed in the constitution, in others that of the United States. This federation differs from ours in one very important particular. By our constitution certain definite powers are granted the federal government. All others are vested either in the states or the people of the states. In the Dominion certain powers are granted to the provinces. All others are vested in the federal government.

The Dominion Parliament.

Though the Dominion began with only four provinces provision was made for the possible admission of others. Manitoba was admitted in 1870, British Columbia in 1871, Prince Edward Island in 1873.

Growth of the Dominion.

In 1846, by the settlement of the Oregon dispute, the line dividing the English possessions from the United States was extended to the Pacific Ocean, and in 1869 the Dominion acquired by purchase (£300,000) the vast territories belonging to the Hudson Bay Company, out of which the great provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan have been carved and admitted into the union (1905). The Dominion now includes all of British North America except the island of Newfoundland, which has steadily refused to join. It thus extends from ocean to ocean. Except for the fact that she receives a Governor General from England and that she possesses no treaty powers, Canada is practically independent. She manages her own affairs, and even imposes tariffs which are disadvantageous to the mother country. That she has imperial as well as local patriotism, however, was shown strikingly in her support of England in the recent South African war. She sent Canadian regiments thither at her own expense to co-operate in an enterprise not closely connected with her own fortunes.

The Canadian Pacific Railway.

The founding of the Canadian union in 1867 rendered possible the construction of a great transcontinental railway, the Canadian Pacific, built between 1881 and 1885. This has in turn reacted upon the Dominion binding the different provinces together, and contributing to the remarkable development of the west. At present another transcontinental railway is being built farther to the north. Canada is connected by steamship lines with Europe and with Japan and Australia. Her population has increased from less than five hundred thousand in 1815 to more than five million. Her prosperity has grown immensely, and her economic life is becoming more varied. Largely an agricultural and timber producing country, manufactures are now developing under the stimulus of protective tariffs, and her vast mineral resources are in process of rapid development.

AUSTRALIA

An eminent English historian, Sir Spencer Walpole, has written that "the greatest fact in the history of England is that she is the mother of the United States. It may be similarly added, that the greatest fact in the history of the nineteenth century is the foundation of a new Britain—which may eventually prove a greater Britain—in the Southern Hemisphere."[1]

Whether Australia will prove a greater Britain or not, only the future can show, but the opening of the twentieth century sees a new "colonial nation" in existence, prosperous, energetic, ambitious. The creation of that new empire has been the work of the nineteenth century, an empire nearly as extensive territorially as the United States or Canada, about three-fourths as large as Europe, and inhabited almost entirely by a population of English descent.

Early explorations.

No systematic exploration of this southern continent, *Terra Australis*, was undertaken until toward the close of

[1] History of England, VI, 336.

the eighteenth century, but certain parts had been sighted or traced much earlier by Spanish, Portuguese, and particularly by Dutch navigators. Among the last, Tasman is to be mentioned, who in 1642 explored the southeastern portion, though he did not discover that the land which was later to bear his name was an island, a fact not known, indeeed, for a century and a half. He discovered the islands to the east of Australia, and gave to them a Dutch name, New Zealand. The Dutch called the *Terra Australis* New Holland, claiming it by right of discovery. But they made no attempt to occupy it. The attention of the English was first directed thither by the famous Captain Cook, who made three voyages to this region between 1768 and 1779. Cook sailed around New Zealand, and then along the eastern coast of this New Holland. He put into a certain harbor, which was forthwith named Botany Bay, so varied was the vegetation on the shores. Sailing up the eastern coast, he claimed it all for George III, and called it New South Wales because it reminded him of the Welsh coast. Seventeen years, however, went by before any settlement was made.

The voyages of Captain Cook.

As Australia was remote, it was considered by English statesmen a good place to which to send criminals, and it was as a convict colony that the new empire began. The first expedition for the colonization of the country sailed from England in May 1787 with 750 convicts on board, and reached Botany Bay in January 1788. Here the first settlement was made, and to it was given the name of the colonial secretary of the day, Sydney. For many years fresh cargoes of convicts were sent out who, on the expiration of their sentences, received lands. Free settlers came too, led to emigrate by various periods of economic depression at home, by promises of land and food, and by an increasing knowledge of the adaptability of the new continent to agriculture, and particularly to sheep raising. By 1820 the population was not far from 40,000. During the first thirty years the government was military in character.

A convict colony.

The free settlers were strongly opposed to having Australia regarded as a prison for English convicts. They were not a desirable class of immigrants, and their presence tended to prevent men from coming whose immigration would have been desirable. As Englishmen came to see that this was an expensive and ineffective way of punishing criminals, and as the free men in Australia vehemently denounced the custom as a stigma upon their adopted land, it was finally abolished in New South Wales in 1840. The custom lingered on, however, in other colonies, and did not entirely disappear until 1853. This question of the transportation of criminals was one of the important questions in Australia during the first part of its history.

Abandonment of this system.

Australia had thus far been mainly a pastoral country, producing wool and hides. But, in 1851 and 1852, rich deposits of gold were found, rivaled only by those discovered a little earlier in California. A tremendous immigration ensued. The population of the colony of Victoria (cut off from New South Wales) increased from 70,000 to more than 300,000 in five years. Australia has ever since remained one of the great gold producing countries of the world.

The discovery of gold.

Thus there gradually grew up six colonies, New South Wales, Queensland, Victoria, South Australia, Western Australia, and the neighboring island of Tasmania. These were gradually invested with self-government, parliaments and responsible ministries in the fashion worked out in Canada. The population increased steadily, and by the end of the century numbered about four million.

The Six Australian Colonies.

The great political event in the history of these colonies was their union into a confederation at the close of the century. Up to that time the colonies had been legally unconnected with each other, and their only form of union was the loose one under the British Crown. For a long time there was discussion as to the advisability of binding them more closely together. Various reasons contributed to convince the Australians of the advantages of federation.

Reasons for their federation.

They have been summarized by Mr. Bryce as follows: "the gain to trade and the general convenience to be expected from abolishing the tariffs established on the frontiers of each colony, the need for a common system of military defense, the advantages of a common legislation for the regulation of railways and the fixing of railway rates, the advantages of a common control of the larger rivers for the purposes both of navigation and of irrigation, the need for uniform legislation on a number of commercial and industrial topics, the importance of finding an authority competent to provide for old age pensions and for the settlement of labor disputes all over the country, the need for uniform provisions against the entrance of colored races (especially Chinese, Malays, and Indian coolies), the stimulus to be given to industry and trade by substituting one great community for six smaller ones." [1]

Creation of the Australian Commonwealth.

Moreover, the desire for nationality, which has accomplished such remarkable changes in Europe in the nineteenth century, was also active here. An Australian patriotism had grown up. Australians desired to make their country the dominant authority in the Southern Hemisphere. They longed for a larger outlook than that given by the life of the separate colonies, and thus both reason and sentiment combined toward the same end, a close union, the creation of another "colonial nation."

Union was finally achieved after ten years of earnest discussion (1890-1900). The various experiments in federation were carefully studied, particularly the constitutions of the United States and Canada. The draft of the constitution was worked over by several conventions, by the ministers and the governments of the various colonies, and was finally submitted to the people for ratification. Ratification being secured, the constitution was then passed through the British Parliament under the title of "The Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act" (1900). The constitution was the work of the Australians. The part taken by England was simply one

[1] Bryce, Studies in History and Jurisprudence, I, 478-479.

of acceptance. Though Parliament made certain suggestions of detail, it did not insist upon them in the case of Australian opposition.

The Federal Parliament.

The constitution established a federation consisting of the six colonies which were henceforth to be called states, not provinces, as in the case of Canada. It created a federal Parliament of two houses, a Senate consisting of six senators from each state, and a House of Representatives apportioned among the several states according to population. The powers given to the Federal Government were carefully defined. The new system was inaugurated January 1, 1901.[1]

NEW ZEALAND

Not included in the new commonwealth is an important group of islands of Australasia called New Zealand, situated 1,200 miles east of Australia. England began to have some connection with these islands shortly after 1815, but it was not until 1839 that they were formally annexed to the British Empire. In 1854 New Zealand was given responsible government, and in 1865 was entirely separated from New South Wales and made a separate colony. Emigration was methodically encouraged. New Zealand was never a convict colony. Population increased and it gradually became the most democratic colony of the Empire. In 1907 the designation of the colony was changed to the Dominion of New Zealand.

New Zealand.

New Zealand consists of two main islands with many smaller ones. It is about a fourth larger than Great Britain and has a population of about 900,000, of whom about 47,000 are aborigines, the Maoris. Its capital is Wellington, with a population of about 60,000. Auckland is an-

[1] A valuable description of this constitution is to be found in Bryce, Studies in History and Jurisprudence, "The Australian Commonwealth." Abstract of this in Beard, Intro. to Eng. Hist., pp. 645-662. See also Bright, Hist. of Eng., V, 197-199. The constitution itself may be found in Dodd, Modern Constitutions. On inauguration of the new government see Annual Register 1901, 444-455.

other important city. New Zealand is an agricultural and grazing country, and also possesses rich mineral deposits, including gold.

New Zealand is of great interest to the world of to-day because of its experiments in advanced social reform, legislation concerning labor and capital, landowning and commerce. State control has been extended over more branches of industry than has been the case in any other country.

Advanced social legislation.

The Government owns and operates the railways.[1] The roads are run, not for profit, but for service to the people. As rapidly as profits exceed three per cent. passenger and freight rates are reduced. Comprehensive and successful attempts are made by very low rates to induce the people in congested districts to live in the country. Workmen going in and out travel about three miles for a cent. Children in the primary grades in schools are carried free, and those in higher grades at very low fares.

The Government also owns and operates the telegraphs and telephones and conducts postal savings banks. Life insurance is largely in its hands. It has a fire and accident insurance department. In 1903 it began the operation of some state coal mines. Its land legislation is remarkable. Its main purpose is to prevent the land from being monopolized by a few, and to enable the people to become landholders. In 1892 progressive taxation on the large estates was adopted, and in 1896 the sale of such estates to the Government was made compulsory, and thus extensive areas have come under government ownership. The State transfers them under various forms of tenure to the landless and working classes. The system of taxation, based on the principle of graduation, higher rates for larger incomes, properties, and inheritances, is designed to break up or prevent monopoly and to favor the small proprietor or producer.

System of taxation.

[1] In 1908 the Government owned 2,474 miles. There were 113 miles of private lines.

In industrial and labor legislation New Zealand has also made radical experiments. Arbitration in labor disputes is compulsory if either side invokes it, and the decision is binding. Factory laws are stringent, aiming particularly at the protection of women, the elimination of "sweating." In stores the Saturday half holiday is universal. The Government has a Labor Department whose head is a member of the Cabinet. Its first duty is to find work for the unemployed, and its great effort is to get the people out of the cities into the country. There is an Old Age Pension Law, enacted in 1898 and amended in 1905, providing pensions of about a hundred and twenty-five dollars for all men and women after the age of sixty-five whose income is less than five dollars a week.

Old Age Pensions.

All this governmental activity rests on a democratic basis. There are no property qualifications for voting, and women have the suffrage as well as men. The referendum has been adopted.

The more advanced parties demand a further extension in the line of social reform; the nationalization of lands and mines, of marine and coastal and intercolonial services; state clothing and boot factories, flour and woolen mills, bakeries, iron-works, and ship building yards. The Australian colony of Victoria has enacted much legislation resembling that described in the case of New Zealand.

BRITISH SOUTH AFRICA

England acquires Cape Colony.

As an incident in the wars against France and her ally and dependent, Holland, England seized the Dutch possession in South Africa, Cape Colony. This colony she retained in 1814, together with certain Dutch possessions in South America, paying six millions pounds as compensation. This was the beginning of English expansion into Africa, which was to attain remarkable proportions before the close of the century. This Dutch colony had been founded as early as 1652 as a port of call for Dutch ships trading with the

Orient. Immigrants came from Holland, and after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes under Louis XIV, many Huguenots joined them. These Frenchmen were gradually completely absorbed in the Dutch population, losing all distinguishing characteristics. England kept the colony in 1814 for the same purpose that the Dutch had founded it, as a port of call, for English commerce with India went by this route, there being then no Suez canal. The population at the time she took possession consisted of about 27,000 people of European descent, mostly Dutch, and of about 30,000 African and Malay slaves owned by the Dutch, and about 17,000 Hottentots. Immigration of Englishmen began forthwith.

Friction with the Boers.

Friction between the Dutch (called Boers, i.e., peasants), and the English was not slow in developing. The forms of local government to which the Boers were accustomed were abolished and new ones established. English was made the sole language used in the courts. The Boers, irritated by these measures, were rendered indignant by the abolition of slavery in 1834. They did not consider slavery wrong. Moreover, they felt defrauded of their property as the compensation given was inadequate—about three million pounds —little more than a third of what they considered their slaves were worth. Even that was made payable in London, a device which enabled London bankers to get a good share. For all the abolition of slavery meant a loss of property, for many a total loss.

The Great Trek.

The Boers resolved to leave the colony and to settle in the interior, where they could live unmolested by the intruders. This migration or Great Trek began in 1836, and continued for several years. About 10,000 Boers thus withdrew from Cape Colony. Rude carts drawn by several pairs of oxen transported their families and their possessions into the wilderness. Some went northeastward and settled in Natal only to find that they were not, for their pains, to be free from English control. In 1842 the English sent troops into

Natal, and in the following year proclaimed it a colony. Many of the Boers trekked again to join their fellow Boers who, while they were going into Natal, had gone into the Orange River country. Such were the beginnings of the Orange Free State, whose capital was Bloemfontein. But again they were followed. The English, in 1848, declared this region a part of the British Empire, under the name of the Orange River Sovereignty. Many of the Orange River Boers, refusing to live under the British flag, trekked again, joining those who, in the earlier migration, had gone farther north across the Vaal, founding a state destined to become famous as the Transvaal or South African Republic, and where it seemed for many years they would be permitted to enjoy the independence which they had made such efforts to secure.

Founding of the Transvaal.

For, in 1852, Great Britain, apparently considering the Transvaal not worth annexing, formally recognized its independence, its entire right to manage its own affairs, by a treaty, the Sand River Convention, and two years later it abandoned the Orange River Sovereignty, by the Convention of Bloemfontein. From this time date the two Boer republics of South Africa, the Orange Free State and the Transvaal or South African Republic.

The Transvaal annexed to Great Britain.

From 1854 to 1899 the Orange Free State pursued its peaceful career unmolested, its independence not infringed upon. The Transvaal, too, was left in the splendid isolation it so much enjoyed, but not for so long a time, for in 1877 England, under Lord Beaconsfield's administration, abruptly declared it annexed to the British Empire, on the ground that its independence was a menace to the peace of England's other South African possessions, as the Boers were frequently involved in wars with the natives who, once aroused, constituted a general menace. A delegation of Boers was sent to England to protest and demand the restoration of their independence. One of the delegates was Paul Kruger, who, as a boy of ten, had followed his father's cattle as they

were driven across the prairie in the Great Trek of 1836. The delegation was told in London by the British ministry that the annexation was irrevocable. The Boers' hatred of the English naturally grew more intense, and they fell to meditating plans for the future.

But in 1880 Lord Beaconsfield was overthrown and Mr. Gladstone came into power. Mr. Gladstone had denounced the annexation, and was convinced that a mistake had been made which must be rectified. He was negotiating with the Boer leaders, hoping to reach, by peaceful means, a solution that would be satisfactory to both sides, when his problem was made immensely more difficult by the Boers themselves, who, in December 1880, rose in revolt and defeated a small detachment of British troops at Majuba Hill, February 27, 1881. In a military sense this so-called battle of Majuba Hill was an insignificant affair, but its effects upon Englishmen and Boers were tremendous and far-reaching. Gladstone, who had already been negotiating with a view to restoring the independence of the Transvaal, which he considered had been unjustly overthrown, did not think it right to reverse his policy because of a mere skirmish, however humiliating.

Majuba Hill.

He therefore restored to the Boers their independence, but with the express reservation of the "suzerainty" of the British Crown, a word carrying no precise meaning, but resented in the Transvaal as a limitation upon its perfect independence, and so understood in England. The Boers were allowed complete self-government with this restriction. Gladstone's action was severely criticised by Englishmen who did not believe in retiring, leaving a defeat unavenged. They denounced the action of the ministry as inimical to the welfare of the South African colonies and damaging to the prestige of the Empire. Gladstone did not believe that he should be deflected from an act of justice and conciliation merely because of a military misfortune of no importance in itself, and he considered that giving up negotiations pre-

Policy of the Gladstone administration.

The Pretoria Convention.

viously begun, promises previously made, would be an act of bad faith. He therefore concluded the Pretoria Convention of 1881 with its mysterious word "suzerainty."

The Boers, on the other hand, considered that they had won their independence by arms, by the humiliation of the traditional enemy, and were accordingly elated. In holding this opinion they were injuring themselves by self-deception and by the idea that what they once had done they could do again, and they were angering the British by keeping alive the memory of Majuba Hill. That name came to be spoken with passion on both sides.

The London Convention.

The Pretoria Convention did not work smoothly, and consequently a new agreement was drawn up in 1884. This, the London Convention, restored to the Transvaal the old name of South African Republic, omitted the preamble of the Pretoria Convention, in which the word suzerainty occurred, and inserted a provision, which was destined to gain tremendous importance later, to the effect that "white men were to have full liberty to reside in any part of the republic, to trade in it, and to be liable to the same taxes only as those exacted from citizens of the republic."[1]

Mr. Gladstone's biographer in summing up the history of the relations of England and the Transvaal says that the Sand River Convention of 1852 conferred independence, that the Proclamation of 1877 took independence away, that the Pretoria Convention of 1881 "in a qualified way gave it back," and that the London Convention of 1884 "qualified the qualification over again till independence, subject to two or three specified conditions, was restored."[2]

The Boers desire unqualified independence.

The London Convention was naturally regarded as a victory by the Boers, and encouraged them to believe that in time the restrictions it contained could be removed. The word "suzerainty" being omitted and "republic" being given them, they felt that they were once more masters in

[1] Morley, Gladstone III, 45.
[2] Ibid.

their own house. On the other hand, they were not entirely independent, as England expressly had the control over their foreign relations. Moreover, the phrase concerning immigration contained the germ of future trouble, which in the end was to result in the violent overthrow of the republic, for a momentous change in the character of the population was impending.

The Boers.

The South African Republic was entirely peopled by Boers, a people exclusively interested in agriculture and grazing, solid, sturdy, religious, freedom-loving, but, in the modern sense, unprogressive, ill-educated, suspicious of foreigners, and particularly of Englishmen. The peace and contentment of this rural people were disturbed by the discovery, in 1884, that gold in immense quantities lay hidden in its mountains, the Rand. Immediately a great influx of miners and speculators began. These were chiefly Englishmen. In the heart of the mining district the city of Johannesburg grew rapidly, numbering in a few years over 100,000 inhabitants, a city of foreigners. Troubles quickly arose between the native Boers and the aggressive, energetic Uitlanders or foreigners.

The Uitlanders.

The Uitlanders gave wide publicity to their grievances. Great obstacles were put in the way of their naturalization; they were given no share in the government, not even the right to vote. Yet in parts of the Transvaal they were more numerous than the natives, and bore the larger share of taxation. In addition they were forced to render military service, which, in their opinion, implied citizenship. They looked to the British Government to push their demand for reforms. The Boer Government was undoubtedly an oligarchy, but the Boers felt that it was only by refusing the suffrage to the unwelcome intruders that they could keep control of their own state, which at the cost of much hardship they had created in the wilderness. In 1895 occurred an event which deeply embittered them, the Jameson Raid—an invasion of the Transvaal by a few hundred troopers

The Jameson Raid.

under Dr. Jameson, the administrator of Rhodesia, with the evident purpose of supporting the Uitlanders, and probably of overturning the Boer Government. The raiders were easily captured by the Boers, who with great magnanimity handed them over to England. This indefensible attack and the fact that the guilty were only lightly punished in England, and that the man whom all Boers held responsible, Mr. Cecil Rhodes, was shielded by the British Government, entered like iron into the souls of the Boers and only hardened their resistance to the demands of the Uitlanders. These demands were refused, and the grievances of the Uitlanders, who now outnumbered the natives perhaps two to one, continued.

Sir Alfred Milner's reports.

A special commissioner, sent out from England in 1897, Sir Alfred Milner, informed his Government early in 1899 that "the spectacle of thousands of British subjects kept permanently in the position of helots, constantly chafing under undoubted grievances, and calling vainly to her Majesty's Government for redress, does steadily undermine the influence and reputation of Great Britain, and the respect for the British Government." Milner was of the opinion that the Boers were aiming ultimately at nothing less than the union of all the Boers, including those of Cape Colony, the ultimate expulsion of the English from South Africa, and the establishment of a great Boer state. "I can see nothing which will put a stop to this mischievous propaganda but some striking proof of the intention of her Majesty's Goverment not to be ousted from its position in South Africa." This claim that the real point at issue was the maintenance of England's position as the paramount power in South Africa exerted a great influence at home. To stop this "mischievous propaganda," which was undermining British influence, the policy of the Transvaal Government must be changed, and it could only be changed by giving the Uitlanders political power. Therefore the right of the suffrage was insisted upon by the English Government,

"no selfish demand," said Milner, as it is "asking for nothing from others which we do not give ourselves." Conferences were held in 1899 at Bloemfontein. But this demand the Boers would not grant, believing that it was a matter of self-preservation, that its bestowal would simply mean the handing over of the country to the foreigner.

War broke out in October 1899. The Orange Free State, no party to the quarrel, threw in its lot with its sister Boer republic. **The South African War.**

This war was lightly entered upon by both sides. Each grossly underestimated both the resources and the spirit of the other. The English Government had made no preparation at all adequate, apparently not believing that in the end this petty state would dare oppose the mighty British Empire. The Boers, on the other hand, had been long preparing for a conflict, and knew that the number of British troops in South Africa was small, totally insufficient to put down their resistance. Moreover, for years they had deceived themselves with a gross exaggeration of the significance of Majuba Hill as a victory over the British. Each side believed that the war would be short, and would result in its favor.

The war, which they supposed would be over in a few months, lasted for nearly three years. England suffered at the outset many humiliating reverses. The war was not characterized by great battles, but by many sieges at first, and then by guerilla fighting and elaborate, systematic, and difficult conquest of the country. It was fought with great bravery and brilliancy on both sides. For the English, Lord Roberts and Lord Kitchener were the leaders, and of the Boers several greatly distinguished themselves, obtaining world wide reputations, Christian de Wet, Louis Botha, Delarey.

The English won in the end by sheer force of numbers. Awakening from the costly misapprehension of the first days concerning the nature of their problem, they proceeded **Victory of the English.**

to make war on a scale absolutely unprecedented in their annals. No general in English history has ever commanded so many troops as did Lord Roberts. During the war England sent about 450,000 men to South Africa. Three hundred and forty thousand came from Great Britain; the others from the colonies, Canada, Australia, India, and Cape Colony. In the closing months Lord Kitchener had more than 250,000 men against perhaps ten or twelve thousand opponents.

Annexation of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State.

Peace was finally concluded on June 1, 1902. The Transvaal and the Orange Free State lost their independence, and became colonies of the British Empire. Otherwise the terms offered by the conquerors were liberal. Generous money grants and loans were to be made by England to enable the Boers to begin again in their sadly devastated land. Their language was to be respected wherever possible.

The work of reconciliation has proceeded with remarkable rapidity since the close of the war. Responsible government, that is, self-government, was granted to the Transvaal Colony in 1906 and to the Orange River Colony in 1907. This liberal conduct of the English Government has had the most happy consequences, as is shown very convincingly by the spontaneity and the strength of the movement for closer union, which culminated in 1909 in the creation of a new "colonial nation" within the British Empire. In 1908 a convention was held in which the four colonies were represented. The outcome of its deliberations, which lasted several months, was the draft of a constitution for the South African Union. This was then submitted to the colonies for approval and, by June 1909, had been ratified by them all. The constitution was in the form of a statute to be enacted by the British Parliament. It became law September 20, 1909.

The South African Union is substantially a unified, rather than a federal state. While the provinces are preserved their powers are very limited. The central government consists of a Governor-General appointed by the Crown; an

Executive Council; a Senate of forty members, eight from each province, and eight appointed by the Governor in Council, and serving for ten years and a House of Assembly, consisting of 121 members, of whom 51 represent Cape of Good Hope Province, 36 Transvaal Province, 17 Orange Free State Province, and 17 Natal Province. Both Dutch and English are official languages and enjoy equal privileges. Difficulty was experienced in selecting the capital, so intense was the rivalry of different cities. The result was a compromise. Pretoria was chosen as the seat of the executive branch of the government, Cape Town as the seat of the legislative branch.

The creation of the South African Union is the most recent triumph of the spirit of nationality which has so greatly transformed the world since 1815. The new commonwealth has a population of about 1,150,000 whites and more than 6,000,000 people of non-European descent. Provision has been made for the ultimate admission of Rhodesia into the Union.

IMPERIAL FEDERATION

At the opening of the twentieth century Great Britain possesses an empire far more extensive and far more populous than any the world has ever seen, covering about thirteen millions of square miles, if Egypt and the Soudan be included, with a total population of over four hundred and twenty millions. This Empire is scattered everywhere, in Asia, Africa, Australasia, the two Americas, and the islands of the seven seas. The population includes a motley host of peoples. Only fifty-four million are English-speaking, and of these about forty-two million live in Great Britain. Most of the colonies are self-supporting. They present every form of government, military, autocratic, representative, democratic. The sea alone binds the Empire. England's throne is on the mountain wave in a literal as well as in a metaphorical sense. Dominance of the oceans is essen-

The far flung British Empire.

tial that she may keep open her communications with her far flung colonies. It is no adventitious circumstance that England is the greatest sea-power of the world, and intends to remain such. She regards this as the very vital principle of her imperial existence.

A noteworthy feature of the British Empire, as already sufficiently indicated, is the almost unlimited autonomy enjoyed by several of the colonies, those where the English stock predominates, Canada, Australia, South Africa, New Zealand. This policy is in contrast to that pursued by the French and German governments, which rule their colonies directly from Paris and Berlin. But this system does not apply to the greatest of them all, India, nor to a multitude of smaller posssessions.

The problem of Imperial Federation.

A question much and earnestly discussed during the last twenty-five years is that of Imperial Federation. May not some machinery be developed, some method be found, whereby the vast empire may be more closely consolidated, and for certain purposes act as a single state? If so, its power will be greatly augmented, and the world will witness the most stupendous achievement in the art of government recorded in its history. The creation of such a Greater Britain has seized, in recent years, the imagination of many thoughtful statesmen.

The increasing importance of the question.

Various causes have occurred to give this question prominence in recent years. The growth of pride in an empire, the like of which has never been seen before in the history of man, is one. The English attitude toward the colonies has, moreover, radically changed in the last century from one of indifference, or passing condescension, to one of lively interest in their welfare and satisfaction in their success. Again, the British Isles alone have rivals in importance now which they did not formerly have. During the period covered by this book, Italy and Germany have arisen, the former with a population nearly as large as that of Great Britain, the other with one larger by half. Russia has increased from forty-five millions to a hundred and fifty, and in the

west the United States have expanded until they stretch from sea to sea, their population mounting from less than nine million to more than ninety. Relatively the British Isles are less commanding than they were. Another reason for federation is that the price paid for an empire so vast as the British is large, the burden heavy. Ought not the constituent parts, which profit from their membership in it, to help support it?

The difficulties in the way, however, of closer union are various and formidable. In the first place it could only include the self-governing colonies, where the English stock predominates. Thus India, with its three hundred millions, would be left out. Moreover, federation implies important concessions from those states that enter. Would England be willing to make such concessions herself, and if she were, would the colonies? The question cannot be answered affirmatively in either case. If the new and closer union is to take the form of a political body in which the British Isles, Canada, Australia, South Africa shall be all represented, what shall that body be? Shall it be the House of Commons? If the colonies send representatives to Westminster they will be a small minority, for the population of Great Britain is forty-two million, theirs collectively thirteen million. Moreover, such representatives could vote on local English questions, could make and unmake ministries. We have here the dilemma which, as we have seen, baffled Gladstone in his attempt to provide Home Rule for Ireland and yet keep her in the Empire. Or shall an entirely new Imperial Parliament be created to which Great Britain and the colonies shall send delegates? What shall be the relation of the new parliament to the old historic one? Again, even in it, the colonists would be outnumbered. Moreover, shall Canada and Australia be forced to go to war at the bidding of a majority composed of Englishmen? To ask these questions is to show the extreme difficulty of answering them.

The difficulties in the way.

The problem of government.

But may not the union be commercial rather than political,

Commercial union.

the latter being so difficult to work out? Here we have the contrast between the mother country, devoted for half a century to free trade, and the colonies, ardent supporters of protection even against Great Britain. The most promising scheme suggested thus far is that of preferential tariffs, England favoring the colonies if the colonies will favor her, and some slight steps in this direction have been taken; for instance, Canada and Australia have recently made some concessions in tariff rates to England which they do not make to other countries. But this arrangement cannot go far until England can make concessions to them which she cannot do under the system of free trade. Mr. Chamberlain, whose interest in imperial development is both broad and deep, is anxious to do this, and he has had much influence in making the question of preferential duties prominent in England to-day. But the election of 1906, resulting in the overwhelming defeat of his party, showed that England was far from ready to abandon free trade, as on the whole to her advantage, if not essential to her very existence.

The whole subject abounds in problems too complex to be easily, if ever, solved. None the less it is one of indisputable interest, a provoking challenge to the boasted and proved ability of English speaking peoples in the art of government and politics.

Colonial conferences.

Perhaps a beginning toward its solution has been found in the colonial conferences, held in recent years in London, the first in 1887, the second in 1897, under the presidency of Mr. Chamberlain, another in 1902, and the latest in 1907. These have discussed at length many phases of the problem, but have as yet accomplished little. The last one, however, established the imperial conference as a permanent institution rather than as an episodic occurrence. Henceforth one is to be held every four years.[1]

[1] The best treatment of this subject in a small compass is to be found in Chapter LVIII of President Lowell's remarkable book, The Government of England, many of whose observations I have incorporated in this paragraph.

Confederations within the Empire.

The work of co-operation, out of which a real federal empire may in time emerge, will, no doubt, be immensely facilitated by the existence of the four self-governing "nations" whose rise has been traced—the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Dominion of New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa. The reduction of the number of units, with which imperial statesmen will have to deal in attempting a more wide-spreading organization, diminishes the difficulties in the way of federation, difficulties at best numerous and formidable enough. The advantages of the combinations that have already been effected can, from an imperial point of view, hardly be exaggerated. Three of these colonial consolidations have been consummated during the first decade of the twentieth century. The movement may proceed with accelerating speed.

CHAPTER XXIII

THE PARTITION OF AFRICA

Lying almost within sight of Europe and forming the southern boundary of her great inland sea is the immense continent, three times the size of Europe, whose real nature was revealed only in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. In some respects the seat of very ancient history, in most its history is just beginning. In Egypt a rich and advanced civilization appeared in very early times along the lower valley of the Nile. Yet only after thousands of years and only in our own day have the sources and the upper course of that famous river been discovered. Along the northern coasts arose the civilization and state of Carthage, rich, mysterious, and redoubtable, for a while the powerful rival of Rome, succumbing to the latter only after severe and memorable struggles. The ancient world knew therefore the northern shores of Africa. The rest was practically unknown. In the fifteenth century came the great series of geographical discoveries, which immensely widened the known boundaries of the world. It might seem that Africa, rather than America and Asia, would have been the important conquest of that marvelous period of human curiosity and courage. But this was not the case. Europe was seeking primarily riches, and riches were to be found, as events proved, in Peru, and Mexico, and India, rather than in the great continental mass on its very threshold. The age of exploration did, it is true, reveal the hitherto unknown outline and magnitude of the continent. Portuguese explorers pushed further and further south until they finally rounded the southern cape, and then sailed away to-

The period of discovery.

ward India, so alluring with its gems and spices. Diaz, Vasco da Gama, are shining names in this romantic history. But the result was not the conquest of Africa and its introduction into European civilization. America, and even Australia, then unknown, were destined to receive the civilization of Europe long before that continent. A melancholy beginning was, however, made. No ancient civilization offered its riches to the spoliation of Europeans, as in Mexico, Peru, and India. But property in human beings was to be had in abundance for little effort. The African slave trade began, "black ivory," and stations were established by the Portuguese, and later by other nations for this business, which was both lucrative and inhuman. These posts were simply along the shores. The great inner mass of the continent remained as before, unknown, mainly because of the difficulty of penetrating it, owing to its lack of rivers navigable from the sea. For centuries Europe, absorbed in multifarious struggles, whence emerged its modern civilization, paid slight attention to the mystery which lay near at hand. Moreover, it had not the means, mechanical and scientific, for the exploration of this enigmatic and dangerous land. And such remained the case down to the nineteenth century, and, indeed, well into it. Africa is the great field of discovery of that century as America was of the fifteenth and sixteenth.

Situation in 1815.

In 1815 the situation was as follows: the Turkish Empire extended along the whole northern coast to Morocco, that is, the Sultan was nominally sovereign of Egypt, Tripoli, Tunis, and Algeria. Morocco was then, as now, independent under its own sultan. Along the western coasts were scattered settlements, or rather stations, of England, France, Denmark, Holland, Spain, and Portugal. Portugal had certain claims on the eastern coast, opposite Madagascar. England had just acquired the Dutch Cape Colony whence, as we have seen, her expansion into a great South African power has proceeded. The interior of the continent was unknown, and was of interest only to geographers.

The French conquest of Algeria.

For sixty years after 1815, progress in the appropriation of Africa by Europe was slow. The most important annexation was that of Algeria by France between 1830 and 1847. In the south, England was spreading out, and the Boers were founding their two republics.

European annexation waited upon exploration. Africa was the "dark continent," and until the darkness was lifted it was not coveted. About the middle of the century the darkness began to disappear. Explorers penetrated further and further into the interior, traversing the continent in various directions, opening a chapter of geographical discovery of absorbing interest. It is impossible within our limits to do more than allude to the wonderful work participated in by many intrepid explorers, Englishmen, Frenchmen, Portuguese, Dutch, Germans, and Belgians. A few incidents only can be mentioned.

The sources of the Nile.

It was natural that Europeans should be curious about the sources of the Nile, a river famous since the dawn of history, but whose source remained enveloped in obscurity. In 1858 one source was found by Speke, an English explorer, to consist of a great lake south of the equator, to which the name Victoria Nyanza was given. Six years later another Englishman, Sir Samuel Baker, discovered another lake, also a source, and named it Albert Nyanza.

David Livingstone.

Two names particularly stand out in this record of African exploration, Livingstone and Stanley. David Livingstone, a Scotch missionary and traveler, began his African career in 1840, and continued it until his death in 1873 at Chitambo, not far from the shores of Lake Bangweolo, which he had previously discovered. He traced the course of the Zambesi River, of the upper Congo, and the region round about Lakes Tanganyika and Nyassa. He crossed Africa from sea to sea in higher latitudes than had hitherto been traversed. He opened up a new country to the world. His explorations caught the attention of Europe, and when, on one of his journeys, Europe thought that he was lost or dead, and an

expedition was sent out to find him, that expedition riveted the attention of Europe as no other in African history had done. It was under the direction of Henry M. Stanley, sent out by the New York *Herald*. Stanley's story of how he found Livingstone was read with the greatest interest in Europe, and heightened the desire, already widespread, for more knowledge about the great continent. Livingstone, whose name is the most important in the history of African exploration, died in 1873. His body was borne with all honor to England and given the burial of a national hero in Westminster Abbey.

Stanley.

Another African explorer was Cameron, sent out from England by the Royal Geographical Society to rescue Livingstone. He failed in this, as Livingstone died before his arrival, but Cameron made a remarkable journey across Africa from east to west. He was the first, indeed, to cross the continent in that direction.

By this time not only was the scientific curiosity of Europe thoroughly aroused, but missionary zeal saw a new field for activity. Thus Stanley's journey across Africa, from 1874 to 1878, was followed in Europe with an attention unparalleled in the history of modern explorations. Stanley explored the equatorial lake region, making important additions to knowledge. His great work was, however, his exploration of the Congo River system. Little had been known of this river save its lower course as it approached the sea. Stanley proved that it was one of the largest rivers in the world, that its length was more than three thousand miles, that it was fed by an enormous number of tributaries, that it drained an area of over 1,300,000 square miles, that in the volume of its waters it was only exceeded by the Amazon.

Stanley's explorations of the Congo.

Thus, by 1880, the scientific enthusiasm and curiosity, the missionary and philanthropic zeal of Europeans, the hatred of slave hunters who plied their trade in the interior, had solved the great mystery of Africa. The map showed rivers and lakes where previously all had been blank.

Africa appropriated by Europe.

Upon discovery quickly followed appropriation. France entered upon her protectorate of Tunis in 1881, England upon her "occupation" of Egypt in 1882. This was a signal for a general scramble. A feverish period of partition succeeded the long, slow one of discovery. European powers swept down upon this continent lying at their very door, hitherto neglected and despised, and carved it up among themselves. This they did without recourse to war by a series of treaties among themselves defining the boundaries of their claims. Africa became an annex of Europe. Out of this rush for territories the great powers, England, France, and Germany, naturally emerged with the largest acquisitions, but Portugal and Italy each secured a share. The situation and relative extent of these may best be appreciated by an examination of the map. Most of the treaties by which this division was effected were made between 1884 and 1890.

The Congo Free State.

One feature of this appropriation of Africa by Europe was the foundation of the Congo Free State. This was the work of the second king of Belgium, Leopold II, a man who was greatly interested in the exploration of that continent. After the discoveries of Livingstone, and the early ones of Stanley, he called a conference of the powers in 1876 "to discuss the question of the exploration, and the civilization of Africa, and the means of opening up the interior of the continent to the commerce, industry, and scientific enterprise of the civilized world," and to consider measures for extinguishing "the terrible scourge of slavery known to prevail over wide and populous tracts in the interior of the continent." This conference was participated in by Great Britain, Belgium, France, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Italy, and Russia. As a result of its deliberations an International African Association was established, which was to have its seat in Brussels, and whose aim was to be the exploration and civilization of central Africa. Each nation wishing to co-operate was to collect funds for the common object.

AFRICA
European Possessions
in 1884.
English Standard Mile (69,16 to 1°)
English
French
Portuguese
Spanish
Abbreviations:
Nat. Natal
Po Pondo Land
Tr Transkei (Fingo Land)
E Gr. East Griqua Land
T Tembu Land
Bas Basuto Land.
MEDITERRANEAN SEA
BLACK SEA
SAHARA
Libyan Desert
Nubia
ARABIA
Tropic of Cancer
Equator
Gulf of Aden
Red Sea
Persian G.
Hadramaut
Yemen
Asia Minor
Mesopotamia
Arabian Desert
Nejd
Hejaz
Mecca
Medina
Jedda
Suez Canal
Cairo
Alexandria
Jerusalem
Damascus
Beirut
Cyprus
Crete
Rhodes
Constantinople
Smyrna
Athens
Malta
Sicily
Sardinia
Corsica
Naples
Rome
Tripoli
Tunis
Algiers
Oran
Gibraltar
Cadiz
Seville
Lisbon
Oporto
Madrid
Barcelona
Valencia
Balearic Is
Marseilles
Madeira Is
Canary Is
Cape Verde Is
Morocco
Mogador
Fezzan
Ghadames
Ghat
Mursuk
Gatrun
Tummo
Kanem
Bornu
Wadai
Kuka
Lake Chad
Kanemi
Messenia
Baghirmi
Darfur
Kordofan
Sudan
Abyssinia
Gondar
Khartum
Kassala
Berber
Suakin
Massawa
Aden
Mocha
Hodeida
Perim I.
Socotra
Abd-el-Kuri
Guardafui C.
Ras Hafun
Berbera
Harar
Addis Ababa
Somali Land
Ogaden
Galla Country
Equatorial Prov.
Bahr-el-Ghasal
Fashoda
Shoa
Kaffa
Lake Rudolf
Lake Victoria
Lake Albert
Lake Tana
Blue Nile
White Nile
Nile
Mahdi Possessions
Anglo-Egyptian
Dar Fur
Kordofan
Aden
Gulf of Aden
Aden
Sokotra
Abd-el-Kuri
Perim I.

ATLANTIC OCEAN
INDIAN OCEAN
Tropic of Capricorn
Equator
LOWER GUINEA
Gaboon
Mayumba
Loango
Kabinda
Banana
Ascension I.
St. Paul de Loanda
Kuanza R.
Benguella
I.S. Helena
Mossamedes
Port Alexandre
Gr. Fish B.
Cunene R.
C. Frio
Kaoko
Damara Land
Swakopmund
Walfish B.
Gr. Namaqua Land
Angra Pequena
Orange R.
Hopetown
Colesberg
CAPE COL.
Cape Town
Cape of Good Hope
Rossel B.
Port Elizabeth
East London
KAFFRARIA
Natal
Durban (Pt. Natal)
St. Lucia B.
ZULULAND
SWAZI
TO
ORANGE FREE STATE
TRANSVAAL
BECHUANA LAND
Ngami L.
Barotse Ld.
LUNDA
Katanga
Lohisa
Mashona Ld.
Matabele Land
Gasa
Sofala
Bazaruto I.
Inhambane
Lourenço Marquez
Delagoa Bay
Mozambique Channel
MADAGASCAR
Port Louis
Mauritius
Réunion
S. Denis
Seychelles
Amirante
Zanzibar
Mombasa
Pemba
Lamu I.
Melinde
Witu
Uyanwesi
Ujiji
Unyoro
Uganda
Victoria Nyanza
Albert Nyanza
Tanganyika
Kivu L.
Bunbon
Kilima Njaro
Mt. Florence
Gondokoro
Makraka
Musmaju
Aruwimi
Leopold II. L.
Leopoldville
Stanley Pool
Kasai R.
Kwango R.
Congo R.
Lukuga R.
Lualaba R.
Moero L.
Bangweolo L.
Nyassa L.
Shire R.
Ruvuma R.
Rovuma R.
Kuando
Cubango
Okavango
Zambezi R.
Quelimane
Chinde
Mozambique
Sena
Tete
Boror
Brantyre
Nassi Be
Mazaro
Johanna
Pt. Amelia
Mayotta
Comoro
Delagoa B.
Kingani R.
Aldabra Is.
Cosmoledo I.
Farquhar I.
Gloriosa I.
Diego Suarez B.
Vohimar
Antanamuru B.
Tamatave
Andevorante
I. Ste. Marie
Tullear
Ambahy
Ft. Dauphin
Inhambane
Limpopo R.
Pretoria
Johannesburg
Mafeking
Kimberley
Vaal R.
Orange R.
Limpopo
Zambezi
Kafue R.
Luapula
Lake Bangweolo
Lake Nyassa
Lake Tanganyika
Lake Victoria Nyanza
Lake Albert Nyanza
Lake Kivu
Lake Bunbon
Lake Kivu
Lake Leopold II.
Lake Moero
Lake Kisale
Lake Ngami
Lake Victoria
Lake Albert
Lake Tanganyika
Lake Nyassa
Lake Bangweolo
Lake Moero
Lake Kisale
Lake Leopold II.
Lake Kivu
Lake Bunbon
Lake Victoria Nyanza
Lake Albert Nyanza

LORD ROBERTS OF KANDAHAR.

International origin of the Congo Free State.

But the international character of the movement thus started was not long maintained. Most of the contributions came from Belgium. Stanley reached Europe in 1878 with the remarkable additions of knowledge which his trip across Darkest Africa had given him. He was sent back the following year nominally under the auspices of the International Association of the Congo, an organization formed in 1879, and the practical successor of the former African Association, just alluded to. Stanley, hitherto an explorer, now became, in addition, an organizer and state builder. During the next four or five years, 1879-84 he made hundreds of treaties with native chiefs and founded many stations in the Congo basin. Nominally an emissary of an international association, his expenses were largely borne by King Leopold II.

The Berlin Conference.

Portugal now put forth extensive claims to much of this Congo region on the ground of previous discovery. To adjust these claims and other matters a general conference was held in Berlin, in 1884-5, attended by all the states of Europe, with the exception of Switzerland, and also by the United States. The conference recognized the existence as an independent power of the Congo Free State, with an extensive area, most of the Congo basin. It was evidently its understanding that this was to be a neutral and international state. Trade in it was to be open to all nations on equal terms, the rivers were to be free to all, and only such dues were to be levied as should be required to provide for the necessities of commerce. No trade monopolies were to be granted. The conference, however, provided no machinery for the enforcement of its decrees. Those decrees have remained unfulfilled. The state quickly ceased to be international, monopolies have been granted, trade in the Congo has not been free to all.

The new state became practically Belgian. In 1885, Leopold II assumed the position of sovereign, declaring that the connection of the Congo Free State and Belgium should

Leopold II and the Congo Free State.

be merely personal, he being ruler of both, and that the former, like the latter, should be entirely neutral. The Belgian parliament gave its consent, and the powers gave their approval. Leopold granted to the new state a constitution of an autocratic character, and in the succeeding years acted as if it were entirely his private possession. His position was that of sovereign and proprietor combined. In 1889 he announced that by his will all his sovereign rights in the Congo should go to Belgium after his death. This, of course, was an infraction of the Berlin Act of 1885 as he had no right to will an international state without the consent of the powers. The powers, however, recorded no protest, probably because the new state was nearly bankrupt, and they were not disposed to contribute to its maintenance and development. In reality the Congo Free State was not a free state at all, but the personal property of King Leopold. He possessed there practically unlimited power in the making and execution of laws. An international state became a personal appanage of the King of Belgium, largely because the powers did nothing for the Congo while Leopold gave it liberal and constant support.

Criticism of Leopold's administration.

In recent years Leopold's policy has been vehemently denounced. State monopolies have been established, and monopolies have been granted to private companies. In the exploitation of the natural resources, particularly the immensely valuable rubber trees, and in the building of railroads, it has been asserted that the natives have been reduced to practical slavery. Fearful stories of inhuman treatment meted out to women as well as to men, of endless and crushing toil imposed upon them, of outrage, murders, whippings freely inflicted, and greatly reducing the population, have gained wide, and it would appear, making some allowance for exaggeration, justified credence. The existence of the gravest abuses was affirmed by a commission of investigation appointed by the King himself. After a study of their report, published in October 1905, a professor in the

University of Brussels wrote as follows: "An examination of the Congo Free State administration reveals the clear and indisputable fact that the Congo Free State is not a colony in the proper sense of the term: it is a financial speculation. The real aims of those in authority are pecuniary—to increase the amount yielded by taxation, to exploit the natural wealth of the country, to effect all that can stimulate the powers of production. Everything else is subordinated to this end. The colony is administered neither in the interest of the natives nor even of the economic interests of Belgium; the moving desire is to assure the sovereign king the maximum of pecuniary benefit." [1]

In recent years the revelations of the atrocious conditions prevailing in the Congo have become steadily more numerous and more shocking. Other powers, notably England and the United States, finally aroused, have demanded reforms. The result has been that the Belgian ministry and Parliament have been forced by the public opinion of the world to take up this question, and in 1908 the Congo Free State was converted outright into a Belgian colony subject, not to the personal rule of the King, but to Parliament.

The Congo Free State made a colony of Belgium.

EGYPT

Egypt, a seat of ancient civilization, was conquered by the Mohammedans soon after the rise of their religion. Some centuries later it was conquered by the Turks, and became a part of the Turkish Empire (1517). It is nominally such to-day, its supreme ruler being the Sultan, who resides in Constantinople. But a series of remarkable events in the nineteenth century has resulted in giving it a most singular and complicated position. To put down certain opponents of the Sultan an Albanian warrior, Mehemet Ali, was sent out early in the nineteenth century. Appointed Governor of Egypt in 1806, by 1811 he had made himself

Egypt.

Mehemet Ali founds a semi-royal house.

[1] Quoted in Bliss, Encyclopedia of Social Reform, 270.

absolute master of the country. He had succeeded only too well. Originally merely the representative of the Sultan, he had become the real ruler of the land. His ambitions grew with his successes. In time he aspired to add Syria to his states, but was checked in this by a European intervention in 1840. He was compelled to acknowledge the suzerainty of the Porte once more, and to limit his rule to Egypt, but he gained in turn the important concession that the right to rule as viceroy should be hereditary in his family. The title was later changed to that of Khedive (1866). The present Khedive, Abbas II, is the seventh ruler of the dynasty thus founded.

Ismail and the rapid growth of the Egyptian debt.

The fifth ruler of this family was Ismail (1863-79). It was under him that the Suez Canal was completed, a great undertaking carried through by a French engineer, Ferdinand de Lesseps, the money coming largely from European investors. This Khedive plunged into the most reckless extravagance. As a result the Egyptian debt rose with extraordinary rapidity from three million pounds in 1863 to eighty-nine million in 1876. This, as well as the increased taxation which characterized the same years, was a crushing burden for a poor and ignorant population. Sir Alfred Milner after studying the situation declared: "There is nothing in the financial history of any country, from the remotest ages to the present time, to equal this carnival of extravagance and oppression."

The Khedive, needing money, sold, in 1875, his shares in the Suez Canal Company to Great Britain for about four million pounds, to the great irritation of the French. They are now worth seven times as much. This was a mere temporary relief to the Khedive's finances, but was an important advantage to England, as the canal was destined inevitably to be the favorite route to India.

The extraordinary increase of the Egyptian debt is the key to the whole later history of that country. The money had been borrowed abroad, mainly in England and France.

fearing the bankruptcy of Egypt, the governments of the two countries intervened in the interest of their investors, and succeeded in imposing their control over a large part of the financial administration. This was the famous Dual Control, which lasted from 1879 to 1883. The Khedive, Ismail, resented this tutelage, was consequently forced to abdicate, and was succeeded by his son Tewfik, who ruled from 1879 to 1892. The new Khedive did not struggle against the Dual Control, but certain elements of the population did. The bitter hatred inspired by this intervention of the foreigners flared up in a native movement that had as its war cry, "Egypt for the Egyptians," and as its leader, Arabi Pasha, an officer in the army. Before this movement of his subjects the Khedive was powerless. It was evident that the foreign control, established in the interests of foreign bond-holders, could only be perpetuated by the suppression of Arabi and his fellow-malcontents, and that that suppression could be accomplished only by the foreigners themselves. Thus financial intervention led directly to military intervention. England sought the co-operation of France, but France declined. She then proceeded alone. A British fleet bombarded Alexandria, and forced its abandonment by Arabi (July 11, 1882). Arabi and his troops withdrew. England then sent an army under General Wolseley, who with great swiftness and precision, marched from the Suez Canal westward across the desert to Cairo. Wolseley defeated Arabi at Tel-el-Kebir, September 13, 1882, and immediately seized Cairo. The rebellion collapsed. Arabi himself was captured and sent to Ceylon.

Intervention of England and France.

Revolt of Arabi Pasha.

English expedition crushes the insurrection.

The English had intervened nominally in the interest of the Khedive's authority against his rebel, Arabi, though they had not been asked so to intervene either by the Khedive himself or by the Sultan of Turkey, legal sovereign of Egypt, or by the powers of Europe. Having suppressed the insurrection, what would they do? Would they with-

draw their army? The question was a difficult one. To withdraw was, in the opinion of the British ministry, of which Gladstone was the head, and Lord Granville the foreign secretary, to leave Egypt a prey to anarchy; to remain was certainly to offend the European powers, which would look upon this as simply another piece of British aggression. Particularly would such action be resented by France, and by the Sultan. The ministry decided neither to annex the country to the British Empire nor to proclaim a British protectorate over it, but to assume the position of "adviser" to the Khedive, whose power would nominally remain what it had been. Under British "advice" the Khedive would himself carry out the reforms considered necessary for the prosperity and welfare of his country. This policy was expressed by Lord Granville in a diplomatic note sent to the various powers of Europe. "Although," so runs the note, "for the present a British force remains in Egypt for the preservation of public tranquillity, her Majesty's Government are desirous of withdrawing it as soon as the state of the country and the organization of proper means for the maintenance of the Khedive's authority will admit of it. In the meantime the position in which her Majesty's Government are placed towards His Highness imposes upon them the duty of giving advice with the object of securing that the order of things to be established shall be of a satisfactory character, and possess the elements of stability and progress." A gloss on the meaning of the word "advice" was furnished a year later by Lord Granville in a communication to the British representative in Egypt, Sir Evelyn Baring, later Lord Cromer. "It should," wrote Lord Granville, "be made clear to the Egyptian ministers and governors of provinces that the responsibility, which for a time rests on England, obliges her Majesty's Government to insist on the adoption of the policy which they recommend, and that it will be necessary that those ministers and governors who do not follow this course should cease to hold their office."

England assumes the position of "adviser."

AMADEUS OF SAVOY, DUKE OF AOSTA, AFTERWARDS KING OF SPAIN

AFRICA
1910.
200 100 0 200 400 600
English Standard Miles 69,16 to 1°
European Possessions
German
French
Spanish
under Turkish Suzerainity.
British
Portuguese
Italian
Belgian
Abbreviations:
Nat. - Natal
Bas. - Basuto Land
Tr. - Transkei (Kingo Land)
Po. - Pondo Land
K. - British Kaffraria
W.Gr. West Griqua Land
E.Gr. East Griqua Land
T. - Tembu Land.
To. - Tongo Land.
SAHARA
Libyan Desert
Nubian Desert
Arabian Desert
Mediterranean Sea
Red Sea
Persian Gulf
Gulf of Aden
Tropic of Cancer
Equator
Spain
Portugal
Italy
Turkey
Greece
Asia Minor
Arabia
Egypt
Abyssinia
Somali Land
Morocco
Algeria
Tripoli
Barca
Fezzan
Mauretania
Senegal & Niger
Upper Senegambia
French Guinea
Sierra Leone
Liberia
Ivory Coast
Gold Coast
Nigeria
Sokoto
Bornu
Wadai
Kamerun
Congo
Anglo-Egyptian Sudan
Equatorial Prov.
Ogaden
Italian Land
Lisbon
Madrid
Oporto
Barcelona
Marseilles
Corsica
Rome
Naples
Sardinia
Sicily
Malta
Tunis
Algiers
Constantine
Oran
Tangier
Gibraltar
Madeira Is.
Canary Is
Mogador
Fez
Tafilelt
Tripoli
Benghazi
Gulf of Sidra
Cairo
Alexandria
Port Said
Suez Canal
Sinai
Jerusalem
Damascus
Beirut
Aleppo
Constantinople
Smyrna
Athens
Crete
Cyprus
Rhodes
Danube
Black Sea
Angora
Erzerum
Batum
Euphrates
Tigris
Persian Gulf
Bahrein
Muscat
Aden
Perim
Hodeida
Mocha
Jeddah
Mecca
Medina
Port Sudan
Suakin
Berber
Khartum
Omdurman
Fashoda
Wadi Halfa
Assuan
Luxor
Thebes
Nile
Red Sea
Gulf of Aden
Abyssinia
Gondar
Adua
Massowah
Harar
Addis Abeba
Shoa
Berbera
Brit. Somali Ld.
Obock
Jibuti
Italian Somali Ld.
Sokotra
Abd-el-Kuri
Ras Hafun
Guardafui
Hadramaut
Yemen
Mahdi 1883/85-1898
Dar Fur
Kordofan
Kaffa
Lado
Bahr el Ghazal
Emin Pasha 1878-89
Rabeh 1879-1900
Kanem
Lake Chad
Bagirmi
Massenia
Kuka
Yola
Adamawa
Gando
Sokoto
Nupe
Borgu
Lagos
Dahomey
Benin
Togo
Ashanti
Coast Colony
Kumasi
Timbuktu
Bassikunnu
Senegal
Niger
Gambia
Kaarta
Massina
Segu Sikoro
Mossi
Fula
Bammako
Jallon
Timbo
Futa Jallon
Konakry
Freetown
Sherboro I.
Monrovia
Founded 1822
Grand Bassa
Cape Palmas
Grand Bassam
Assinie
Porto Novo
Whydah
Lagos
Akassa
Old Calabar
Cameroons Mt.
Fernando Po
Elobey
Corisco
Gaboon
Libreville
Loango
Cabinda
Kongo
Loanda
Benguela
Mossamedes
Walfisch Bay
Damaraland
Ovampo
Great Namaqua Land
Little Namaqua Land
Cape Colony
Cape Town
Orange Free State
Transvaal
Pretoria
Johannesburg
Natal
Durban
Basuto Land
Kaffraria
Griqua Land
Pondo Land
Tembu Land
Delagoa Bay
Lourenco Marques
Beira
Mozambique
Zambesi
Shire
Nyassa
Tanganyika
Victoria Nyanza
Albert Nyanza
Albert Edward Nyanza
Uganda
Unyoro
Ruwenzori
Mt. Kenia
Kilimanjaro
Zanzibar
Pemba
Mombasa
Melinda
Lamu
Juba
Wadelai
Lado
Fashoda
Khartum
Berber
Dongola
Nubia
Kordofan
Darfur
Wadai
Tibesti
Borku
Ennedi
Air or Timbuktu
Asben
Agades
Damergu
Kano
Zaria
Nupe
Ilorin
Yoruba
Benin
Dahomey
Togo
Ashanti
Kumasi
Coast Colony
Ivory Coast
Liberia
Sierra Leone
Gold Coast
Nigeria
Sokoto
Bornu
Wadai
Kamerun
Congo
Anglo-Egyptian Sudan
Equatorial Prov.
Ogaden
Italian Land

ATLANTIC OCEAN
INDIAN OCEAN
Equator
Annobon
1484 Port. 1778 Sp.
Ascension I.
1815 Br.
St. Helena
1651 Br.
Cape Verde Islands
Cape Town
Founded 1652
Cape of Good Hope
Tropic of Capricorn
Greenwich
West Longitude
East Longitude
The Boer Republics Until 1902.
SOUTH AFRICAN REPUBLIC
Pretoria
Johannesburg
ORANGE FREE STATE
Bloemfontein
Ladysmith
Durban
Pietermaritzburg
Kimberley
Mafeking
Vryburg
Lourenco Marquez
Delagoa Bay
1875
Inhambane
Beira
Tullear
Mozambique Channel
MADAGASCAR
French Protectorate
1896
Colony
1909
Tamatave
Antananarivo
Majunga
Diego Suarez
Nossi Be
1841 Fr.
Mohimar
Comoro Is
1841/85
Mayotta
Fr.
Johanna
Gloriosa I.
Aldabra
Cosmoledo
Farquhar I.
Seychelles
Br.
Amirante
Br.
Mombasa
1880 Br.
Zanzibar
Brit Prot. 1890
Dar-es Salaam
Kismaju
Lamu I.
Witu 1885-90 Ger.
Malfia Kiwindje I.
Pemba
Tabora
1885 Ger. Af. Co.
GERMAN EAST AFRICA
1890 German Empire
Victoria Nyanza
Bukoba
Muansa
Kilima Njaro
Meinda
Usambara
Usagara
Uganda
Unyamwesi
Ujiji
Tanganyika
Kavalli
Kabinda
Banana
1886/1901
Boma
Loango
Brazzaville
Stanley Pool
Leopoldville
Congo River
BELGIAN CONGO
1909
CONGO STATE
Leopold II
1885
Lado
Equatoria
Bahr el Ghazal
Darfur
Kordofan
Nile
Khartum
Berber
Abyssinia
Gallas
Somali
Harar
Zeila
Obock
Tajura
Aden
Perim
Suez Canal
Red Sea
Gulf of Aden
Arabia
Muscat
Persian Gulf
Bahrein
Bushire
Basra
Euphrates R.
Tigris R.
Mesopotamia
Bagdad
Mosul
Armenia
Caucasus
Caspian Sea
Black Sea
Constantinople
Smyrna
Asia Minor
Cyprus
Crete
Malta
Gibraltar
Spain
Portugal
Madeira
Canary Is
Azores
Cape Verde Islands
S. Antao
S. Vincente
S. Nicolau
Portuguese Guinea
Bissagos Is
Bissao
Bathurst
Gambia
Dakar
Cape Verde
S. Louis
Senegal
Boavista
Mato
Fogo
S. Thiago
Brava
Sal
Bissagos
Butaina Port
Founded 1576
St. Paul de Loanda
Kuanza R.
Benguella
Bihe
Mossamedes
Founded 1840
Porto Alexandre
Gr. Fish B.
Cunene R.
Frio
Huilla
Cubango R.
Cuito
Cuando
Cubango R.
Okavango
Okavango R.
Zambezi R.
Kwando R.
Chobe R.
Linyanti R.
Ngami L.
Tati
Limpopo R.
Sabi
Pungwe R.
Beira
Buzaruto I.
Sofala
1505
Quelimane
Mozambique
1498/1507
Mozambique Channel
Angra Pequena
Luderitz Land
Orange R.
Gr. Nama-Land
Berseba
Windhoek
Damara Land
SO. WEST AFRICA
GERMAN
Kaoko
Otoi
Swakopmund
Walfish B.
1878 Br.
Cunene R.
Frio
Mossamedes
Porto Alexandre
Gr. Fish B.
Benguella
Bihe
Huilla
Cubango R.
Cuito
Cuando

MANUEL THE SECOND OF PORTUGAL.

These two utterances described the anomalous position of England in Egypt in 1883, and they still describe it. A British force still remains in Egypt, the "occupation" continues, advice is compulsory. England has often been asked when she intends to keep her promise. No answer has been given. She is ruler in fact, not in law. The Dual Control ended in 1883, and England began in earnest the process of reconstruction and reform which has been proceeding ever since under the real guidance of Lord Cromer, the British Consul-General in Egypt.[1]

The English "occupation."

In intervening in Egypt in 1882, England became immediately involved in a further enterprise which ended in disaster and humiliation. Egypt possessed a dependency to the south, the Soudan, a vast region comprising chiefly the basin of the Upper Nile, a poorly organized territory with a varied, semi-civilized, nomadic population, and a capital at Khartoum. This province, long oppressed by Egypt, was in full process of revolt. It found a chief in a man called the Mahdi, or leader, who succeeded in arousing the fierce religious fanaticism of the Soudanese by claiming to be a kind of Prophet or Messiah. Winning successes over the Egyptian troops, he proclaimed a religious war, the people of the whole Soudan rallied about him, and the result was that the troops were driven into their fortresses and there besieged. Would England recognize any obligation to preserve the Soudan for Egypt? Gladstone, then prime minister, determined to abandon the Soudan. But even this was a matter of difficulty. It involved at least the rescue of the imprisoned garrisons. The ministry was unwilling to send a military expedition. It finally decided to send out General Gordon, a man who had shown a remarkable power in influencing half-civilized races. It was understood that there was to be no expedition. It was apparently supposed that somehow Gordon, without military aid, could accom-

Loss of the Soudan.

[1] Lord Cromer resigned his position as His Majesty's Agent and Consul-General in Egypt, in 1907.

plish the safe withdrawal of the garrisons. He reached Khartoum, but found the danger far more serious than had been supposed, the rebellion far more menacing. He found himself shortly shut up in Khartoum, surrounded by frenzied and confident Mahdists. At once there arose in England a cry for the relief of Gordon, a man whose personality, marked by heroic, eccentric, magnetic qualities, bafflingly contradictory, had seized in a remarkable degree the interest, enthusiasm, and imagination of the English people. But the Government was dilatory. Weeks, and even months, went by. Finally, an expedition was sent out in September 1884. Pushing forward rapidly, against great difficulties, it reached Khartoum January 28, 1885, only to find the flag of the Mahdi floating over it. Only two days before the place had been stormed and Gordon and eleven thousand of his men massacred. Public opinion held Gladstone responsible, and as a result his ministry was quickly overthrown.

Death of Gordon.

For the next decade the Soudan was left in the hands of the dervishes, completely abandoned. But it was certain that the reconquest of the provinces would some day be attempted. Various forces contributed to this end—the national honor, the feeling that Gordon must be avenged, the sense of humiliation that the Egyptian empire had grown smaller under English rule, the conviction that the power that controls the lower reaches of the Nile must, for its own safety, control the upper reaches and the sources, also. And another cause was the pronounced growth during these years, in England as elsewhere, of the spirit of imperialism, eager for an onward march. In 1896 an Anglo-Egyptian army was sent into the Soudan under General Kitchener. Building a railway as he advanced, in order properly to supply his army, he progressed "very slowly, but very surely." At the battle of Omdurman, September 2, 1898, the power of the dervishes was completely annihilated. Thus the Soudan was recovered, but it was recovered, not for

Recovery of the Soudan.

Egypt, but for England and Egypt. The British and the Egyptian flags were both raised over the conquered field. Thus the power of England in the Soudan rests technically upon a different basis than does its power in Egypt. For all practical purposes, however, both are simply parts of the British Empire.

CHAPTER XXIV

SPAIN AND PORTUGAL

SPAIN SINCE 1823

Spain.

We have traced the history of Spain from the downfall of Napoleon to the year 1823, and have seen the restored King Ferdinand VII reign in a manner so cruel, so unintelligent, and tyrannical that the people rose in insurrection and insisted upon being accorded a liberal constitution.[1] And we have seen that as a result the powers, commonly called the Holy Alliance, intervened in 1823 to put down this reform movement, sent a French army into the peninsula, and restored to Ferdinand his former absolute power. This recovery of his former position through foreign aid was followed by a period of disgraceful and ruthless revenge on the part of Ferdinand upon those who had stood out as Liberals, or had merely been lukewarm toward the King. Forced finally by the energetic remonstrances of the French, who had put him back upon his absolute throne, to moderate the frenzy of his wrath, he was obliged to grant an amnesty, which proved, however, to be most deceptive, as it excepted from its operation fifteen different classes. The royal rage was slow in subsiding. Hundreds were executed at the order of courts-martial for the most trivial acts in which there was the slightest tinge of liberalism, such as uttering so-called "subversive" cries, or possessing a portrait of Riego, or defacing an inscription "Long live the Absolute King." Various classes were carefully watched as "suspects," military men, lawyers, doctors, professors, and even veterinary surgeons. Universities and clubs, political and social, were closed as dangerous, yet most of them were

Revenge of Ferdinand VII after 1823.

"Subversive" cries.

[1] See Chapter III.

entirely innocuous, and little disposed to criticise or disturb the existing order. The University of Cervera, for instance, had begun an address to the monarch with the reassuring words, "Far from us the dangerous novelty of thinking." After closing the universities as inimical to society, Ferdinand endowed a school of bull-fighting at Seville.

Loss of the American colonies.

Ferdinand VII ruled for ten years after his second restoration, and in the spirit of unprogressive, unenlightened absolutism. His reign is not signalized by any attempt to improve the conditions of a country that sorely needed reform. It is notable mainly for the loss of the immense Spanish empire in the new world, and the rise of the independent states of Central and South America. Practically nothing remained under the scepter of the King save Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines.

The question of the succession.

Ferdinand's chief interest in the last years of his reign was the determination of the succession. He had no heir. But, assured, in March 1830, that one was about to be born to him, he wished that the child, whether son or daughter, should succeed him. In the case of a daughter, however, the Salic law would stand in the way. This law was not a native product of the evolution of the Spanish monarchy. For centuries the laws of Castille and Leon had permitted women to rule, and one of the great figures in Spanish history was Isabella, Queen of Castille, the patroness of Columbus, who, moreover, upon her death was succeeded by her daughter. But with the accession of the Bourbon line of monarchs the Salic law was introduced. It was a French importation, resting on the decree of Philip V, issued in 1713. As the king was absolute, his decree made it law.

The Pragmatic Sanction.

In 1789 Charles IV prepared to rescind this law. A decree was drawn up, called the Pragmatic Sanction, making the change. But this decree was not published, and was known only to a few. Forty years later, in March 1830, Ferdinand VII drew it forth and promulgated it, whereupon Don Carlos, his brother, and the next in the line of succession,

if the Salic law were not repealed, issued a public protest and announced his intention to assert his rights to the crown if the contingency should arise. In October 1830 a daughter, Isabella, was born.

The matter now became the subject of court bickering and intrigue, one faction struggling for the withdrawal of the new decree, the other for its maintenance. In 1832 the King fell ill, and, believing his end to be near, and dominated at the time by the supporters of Don Carlos, he signed a paper revoking the Pragmatic Sanction, September 18, 1832. The King, contrary to all expectations, began to recover, whereupon his sister-in-law, aunt of the little Isabella, forced her way to his bedside, berated him for his weakness, had the decree brought her, revoking the Pragmatic Sanction, and tore it up.

Isabella proclaimed Queen.

The King did not change his mind again, and when he died, September 29, 1833, his daughter Isabella, three years of age, was proclaimed Queen, with her mother, Christina, as Regent. Christina was in power seven years, from 1833 to 1840, when she was driven into exile. During that time the Carlist war and the political evolution of the kingdom constituted the two chief series of events.

The Carlist War.

Don Carlos, true to his word, refusing to recognize the revocation of the Salic law, proclaimed himself king immediately after the death of Ferdinand, and a war of seven years was necessary to determine whether he or his niece, Isabella, should henceforth be the ruler of Spain. The supporters of Isabella, called Christinos, after the Regent Christina, had the advantage of being in actual possession of Madrid and the machinery of government. They also controlled a part of the army. Don Carlos, on the other hand, was supported by the clergy and nobility, and all who believed in thorough-going absolutism, many of whom considered even the régime of the late Ferdinand too mild. The war between these factions was very irregular and incoherent, and is of little interest. As neither side had numerous

troops or large resources, the fighting was carried on in guerilla fashion by small detachments. Local issues entered in to make confusion worse confounded.

Christina had no desire to use her position for the purpose of reforming Spain. "I will maintain scrupulously," she said at the outset, "the form and fundamental laws of the monarchy, admitting none of the dangerous innovations of which we already know too well the cost. The best form of government for a country is that to which it is accustomed." Christina was an absolutist by training and conviction. Yet under her the Spanish monarchy was changed from an absolute to a constitutional one. She saw the Carlists victorious in the north, and even gaining a part of old Castille. She was forced to appeal to the Liberals for support, and to gain them was obliged to grant the Royal Statute of 1834. This established a parliament divided into two bodies, the Chamber of Peers and the Chamber of Deputies. The latter was to be elected by the property owners for a term of three years. The Chambers were to have the power to vote taxes and laws. But the Government was to have sole right to propose laws. Ministers, moreover, were not to be responsible to the Chambers, to rise and fall according to their will, but were to be responsible to the monarch alone. The Crown could summon and dissolve the Chamber of Deputies, but a year must not pass without a meeting of Parliament. This statute resembled the French Charter of 1814. It granted a certain amount of individual liberty. It created a parliament which represented the propertied class, but whose powers were not large. It marks some progress, as by it, by action of the Crown itself, instead of by action of revolutionists, as hitherto, Spain became a constitutional state. The gain, though largely nominal, was something. It did not satisfy the Liberals, but it contributed somewhat to the political education of the country.

The Royal Statute, 1834.

The parliamentary history of Spain, opening in 1834,

Disturbed political life.

was much disturbed, bewildering and unprofitable to follow. Ministries changed with amazing frequency, parties were more nominal than real, not representing bodies of divergent political principles, but serving as masks for men who were eager to get into office as an easy method of gaining a livelihood. The ministries were short; in twenty-five years, from 1833 to 1858, there were 47 presidents of council, 61 ministers of the interior, 78 of finance, and 96 of war.

The Liberals were divided into two groups, the Moderates and the Progressists. The Moderates accepted the Statute of 1834, which so carefully guarded the rights of the monarch, and gave him such power over the chambers. But the Progressists demanded the far more liberal Constitution of 1812, which clearly proclaimed the sovereignty of the people and made Parliament more powerful than the monarch. As the Carlist war continued unfavorable, Christina was driven to make further concessions. The Constitution of 1837 was accordingly promulgated, more liberal than the Statute of 1834, less liberal than the Constitution of 1812. The Parliament or Cortes were henceforth to consist of a Senate and a Congress, the former to be appointed for life and, under certain restrictions, by the Crown, the latter to be elected by the voters for three years. This Constitution had been framed by a constituent Cortes, whereas the Statute of 1834 was merely a royal decree.

The Constitution of 1837.

The Carlist war was finally brought to a close, with the help of England and France, in 1840, but at the same time the Queen Regent was driven from the country. Actual direction of the government now fell for many years into the hands of rival military leaders. The war had left the army the strongest force in the state. Isabella II was declared of age in 1843, and the government was carried on henceforth in her name. Her reign, which lasted until 1868, was one, on the whole, of reaction. Adhering tenaciously to the forms of religion, and to the principle of monarchical authority, the Queen was influenced throughout by her favor-

Isabella II declared of age.

ites, by a camarilla, and did not observe the spirit, and frequently not the letter, of the constitution. Her reign was marked by absolutism nearly as unqualified as that of her predecessors. Constitutional forms were used to cover arbitrary actions. It was a period of short and weak ministries, court intrigue, petty politics, a period little instructive. Whatever disturbances occurred were vigorously repressed.

The Mexican Expedition.

In 1861 Spain joined England and France in sending an expedition to Mexico to enforce certain claims upon the Mexican government. Spain and England quickly withdrew from this undertaking, leaving France to embark upon one of the most ill-starred enterprises of Napoleon III. In 1861 also Spain took possession again of her former colony of San Domingo, only to relinquish it a little later as the result of a revolt.

Dissatisfaction with the existing régime, marked, as it was, by arbitrariness, by religious and intellectual intolerance, by abuses and corruption, and by the scandalous immorality of the Queen, increased as the reign progressed. The more liberal politicians and officers in the army and navy, persecuted under this régime, became revolutionary. In 1865 an insurrection broke out, led by General Prim. It was suppressed and Prim sought refuge in exile. In 1866 and 1867 similar movements occurred, likewise abortive. But in 1868 the issue was different. More widespread than the others, and more carefully organized, this revolt resulted in the flight of the Queen to France, and in the establishment of a provisional government, in which Marshal Serrano and General Prim were the leading figures. The reign of the Spanish Bourbons was declared at an end, and universal suffrage, religious liberty, and freedom of the press were proclaimed as the fundamental principles of the future constitution. The Society of Jesus was suppressed.

The overthrow of Isabella II.

The Cortes were elected a little later by universal suffrage, and the future government of Spain was left to their

determination. They drew up a constitution based upon popular sovereignty, and promulgated it in June 1869. They pronounced in favor of a monarchy and against a republic, by a vote of 214 to 71. They established a regency under Marshal Serrano, to conduct the government until a king should be chosen. This proved to be no easy task. The queen, Isabella II, abdicated in favor of her son Alfonso, but those in power were opposed to any representative of the House of Bourbon. It was considered necessary that the king should be a Roman Catholic; that, moreover, he should be of royal blood. Some advocated a son of Louis Philippe, others a Portuguese prince. Finally, after long negotiations, Prince Leopold of Hohenzollern was chosen. His candidacy is important in history as having been the immediate occasion of the Franco-Prussian war of 1870. In the end Leopold declined the offer.

The Regency of Marshal Serrano.

At length, November 1870, the crown was offered by a vote of 191 out of 311, to Amadeo, second son of Victor Emmanuel II.[1] The smallness of the majority was ominous. The new king's reign was destined to be short and troubled. Landing in Spain at the close of 1870, he was coldly received. Opposition to him came from several sources—from the Republicans, who were opposed to any monarch; from the Carlists, who claimed that the heir of Don Carlos, brother of Ferdinand VII, was the lawful king; from the supporters of Alfonso, son of Isabella, who held that he was the legitimate ruler. Amadeo was disliked also for the simple reason that he was a foreigner. The clergy attacked him for his adherence to constitutional principles of government. No strong body of politicians supported him. Ministries rose and fell with great rapidity, eight in two years, one of them lasting only seventeen days. Each change left the government more disorganized and more unpopular. Believing that the problem of giving peace

Amadeo of Savoy chosen king.

[1] Sixty-three voted for a republic; the other votes were scattering or blank.

to Spain was insoluble, and wearying of an uneasy crown, Amadeo, in February 1873, resigned his powers into the hands of the Cortes. In a letter to that body he said, "I realize that my good intentions have been in vain. For two long years have I worn the crown of Spain, and Spain still lives in continual strife, departing day by day more widely from that era of peace and prosperity for which I have so ardently yearned. I am to-day firmly convinced of the barrenness of my efforts and the impossibility of attaining my aims. These, deputies, are the reasons that move me to give back to the nation, and in its name to you, the crown offered me by the national suffrage, renouncing it for myself, my children, and my successors." **Abdication of Amadeo.**

The abdication of Amadeo left the nation without an executive. The ministry necessarily disappeared with the monarch, whose servant it was. The Cortes alone remained as a depository of power. In the Cortes there were many Republicans. Feeling that monarchy by divine right had failed in the person of Isabella II, and ought not to be restored either by calling her or her son to the throne, feeling also that elective monarchy had failed in the person of Amadeo, they held that the only alternative was the republic, that, moreover, it was the only form of government consistent with the principle of the sovereignty of the people. The Monarchists, taken by surprise, had no definite plan. The Cortes, therefore, proclaimed the Republic, February 12, 1873, by a vote of 258 to 32, and declared that the constitution should be framed by a convention to be chosen especially for that purpose. Castelar, a prominent Republican, speaking of the fall of the monarchy, declared that it had not been brought about by violence. "No one destroyed it. It died of natural causes. The monarchy died of internal decomposition. It died by the providence of God. The Republic is the creation of circumstances. It comes from a conjuncture of society and nature and history." **The establishment of the republic.**

But the advent of the Republic did not bring peace. In-

deed, its history was short and agitated. European powers, with the exception of Switzerland, withdrew their diplomatic representatives. The United States alone recognized the new government. The Republic lasted from February 1873 to the end of December 1874. It established a wide suffrage, proclaimed religious liberty "in all its purity," proposed the complete separation of the church and state, and voted unanimously for the immediate emancipation of slaves in Porto Rico.

The causes of its fall.

The causes of its fall were numerous. The fundamental one was that the Spaniards had had no long political training, essential for efficient self-government, no true experience in party management. The leaders did not work together harmoniously. Moreover, the Republicans, once in power, immediately fell apart into various groups, of which the principal were those who believed in a centralized republic and those who believed in a federal republic. The Federalists differed even among themselves as to the size of the various units that should form the federation. The avowed enemies of the Republic were numerous, the Monarchists, the clergy, offended by the proclamation of religious liberty, all those who profited by the old régime, and who resented the reforms which were threatened. Also, the problems that faced the new government increased the confusion. Three wars were in progress during the brief life of the Republic—a war in Cuba, a Carlist war, and a war with the Federalists in southern Spain.

Presidents succeeded each other rapidly. Figueras was in office four months, Pi y Margall six weeks, Salmeron and Castelar for short periods. Finally, Serrano became practically dictator. The fate of the Republic was determined by the generals of the army, the most powerful body in the country, who declared in December 1874 in favor of Alfonso, son of Isabella II. The Republic fell without a struggle. Alfonso, landing in Spain early in 1875, and being received in Madrid with great enthusiasm, assumed

Alfonso XII recognized as king.

the government, promising a constitutional monarchy. The Carlist war was brought to an end in the following year. Thus, six years after the dethronement of Isabella, her son was welcomed back as king. Those six years had been characterized by instability and governmental confusion. The new King had followed his mother into exile in 1868, and had spent the intervening years in study in France, Austria, Switzerland, and England. He was now seventeen years of age. His reign lasted ten years, until his death in November 1885. In 1876 a new Constitution was voted, the last in the long line of ephemeral documents issuing during the century from either monarch or Cortes or revolutionary junta. Still in force, the Constitution of 1876 declared the person of the king inviolable, created a responsible ministry, a parliament of two chambers, a Congress of Deputies, elected by voters meeting a property qualification, and a Senate, consisting of three classes, those sitting in their own right, such as sons of the king, grandees of a certain wealth, admirals of the navy, archbishops, life members appointed by the king, and elective members, chosen for five years by certain corporations, such as provincial legislatures and universities, and by the wealthier citizens. The executive power was vested in the king, the legislative in the king and the parliament. No project should become law unless passed by both houses. Spain possesses the machinery of parliamentary government, ministries rising and falling according to the votes of parliament. Practically, however, the political warfare is largely mimic. The two chief parties in 1876 were the Conservatives, led by Canovas, and the Liberals, led by Sagasta. But they were divided, not so much by principle, as by a desire for office. Parliamentary institutions have been used for purposes of personal advantage rather than for the increase of the national well-being through courageous and intelligent legislation. They constitute a parody on the parliamentary system.

The Constitution of 1876.

Death of Alfonso XII.

Alfonso XII died in 1885. His wife, an Austrian princess, Maria Christina, was proclaimed regent for a child born a few months later, the present King Alfonso XIII. Maria Christina, during the sixteen years of her regency, confronted many difficulties. Of these the most serious was the condition of Cuba, Spain's chief colony. An insurrection had broken out in that island in 1868, occasioned by the gross misgovernment of the mother country. This Cuban war dragged on for ten years, cost Spain nearly 100,000 men and $200,000,000, and was only ended in 1878 by means of lavish bribes and liberal promises of reform in the direction of self-government. As these promises were not fulfilled, and as the condition of the Cubans became more unendurable, another rebellion broke out in 1895. This new war, prosecuted with great and savage severity by Weyler, ultimately aroused the United States to intervene in the interests of humanity and civilization.

The Spanish-American War.

A war resulted between the United States and Spain in 1898, which proved most disastrous to the latter. Her naval power was annihilated in the battles of Santiago and Cavite; her army in Santiago was forced to surrender, and she was compelled to sign the Treaty of Paris of 1898, by which she renounced Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippine Islands.

Loss of Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines.

The Spanish Empire, which at the opening of the nineteenth century bulked large on the map of the world, comprising immense possessions in America, and the islands of both hemispheres, has disappeared. Revolts in Central and South America, beginning when Joseph Napoleon became King in 1808, and ending with Cuban independence ninety years later, have left Spain with the mere shreds of her former possessions, Rio de Oro, Rio Muni in western Africa, and a few small islands off the African coast. The Canary Islands are not colonies but form one of the provinces of the kingdom. The disappearance of the Spanish colonial empire is one of the most significant features of the nineteenth century. Once one of the great world powers, Spain

is to-day a state of inferior rank, a negligible quantity in this era of world politics.

In 1902 the present King, Alfonso XIII, formally assumed the reins of government. He married in May 1906 Princess Ena of Battenberg. Profound and numerous reforms are necessary to range the country in the line of progress. Though universal suffrage was established in 1890, political conditions and methods have not changed. Illiteracy is widespread. Out of a population of 18,000,000 perhaps 12,000,000 are illiterate. In recent years attempts have been made to improve this situation; also to reduce the influence of the Roman Catholic Church in the state. Nothing important has yet been accomplished in this direction. Public worship is forbidden to the members of any other church.

Alfonso XIII assumes power.

PORTUGAL, 1815-1909

Portugal, like other countries, felt the full shock of Napoleonic aggression. French armies were sent into the peninsula in 1807 for the purpose of forcing that country into the Continental System, of closing all Europe to English commerce. The royal family fled from Lisbon just as the French were approaching, and went to the capital of Portugal's leading colony, Brazil. The actual authority in Portugal for several years was the English army and Lord Beresford. Portugal suffered during this period the immense loss of a million in population. After the fall of Napoleon the Portuguese hoped for the return of the royal family, but this did not occur. The King, John VI, was contented in Rio de Janeiro; moreover, he felt that his departure from Brazil would be the signal for a rebellion in that colony, which would result in its independence. The situation gave great dissatisfaction to the Portuguese, whose pride was hurt by the fact that they no longer had a court in Lisbon, and that the mother country seemed to be in the position of a colony, inferior in importance to Brazil.

Flight of royal family to Brazil, 1807.

Moreover, Beresford remained in Portugal after 1814, and was the real ruler of the country. The relations between the Portuguese and the English were strained from the beginning. The army was disaffected because it was not promptly paid, and because many of the positions in it were held by Englishmen. An occasion for the explosion of the growing discontent was furnished by the Spanish revolution of 1820. Encouraged by the movement in the sister state, the Portuguese army revolted, and the Cortes were summoned to frame a constitution. This body adopted, in 1822, what was practically the famous Spanish Constitution of 1812, which, as has been shown, was largely the French Constitution of 1791, the ideal of radicals in various countries, which, moreover, possessed the advantage of being ready made. The King accepted it, and Portugal, hitherto an absolute monarchy, became a constitutional one. The King meanwhile had returned from Brazil, leaving his eldest son, Dom Pedro, as regent of that country. In 1822 Brazil declared itself an independent empire, under Dom Pedro I. Three years later its independence was recognized by Portugal.

Portuguese revolution of 1820.

Loss of Brazil.

Meanwhile, the Portuguese Constitution proved short-lived. As the absolutists regained control in Spain in 1823, the absolutists in Portugal also were encouraged to attempt to recover their power, and succeeded. The first experiment in constitutional government had been very brief, but it resulted in leaving a constitutional party confronting an absolutist party.

The death of King John VI in 1826 created a new crisis, which distracted the country for many years. His eldest son, Dom Pedro, was Emperor of Brazil. His younger son was Dom Miguel. Dom Pedro was lawfully King of Portugal. He opened his reign as Pedro IV by granting a liberal constitutional charter introducing parliamentary government of the English type. Then, not wishing to return from Brazil, he abdicated in favor of his daughter, Donna Maria

da Gloria. Hoping to disarm his brother Dom Miguel, who himself wished to be king, he betrothed his daughter, aged seven, to Dom Miguel, decreeing that the marriage should be consummated when Donna Maria became of age. He then appointed Dom Miguel regent for the little princess. But Miguel, landing in Portugal in 1828, was proclaimed king by the absolutists. He accepted the crown. His reign was odious in the extreme, characterized by cruelty and arbitrariness, by a complete defiance of the law, of all personal liberty, by imprisonments and deportations and executions. Dom Pedro abdicated his position as Emperor of Brazil, and returned to Europe to take charge of the cause of his daughter. This civil war between Maria da Gloria and Dom Miguel resulted in the favor of the former. Dom Miguel formally renounced all claims to the throne and left Portugal never to return (1834).

Donna Maria da Gloria.

Maria reigned until her death in 1853, a reign rendered turbulent and unstable by the violence of political struggles and by frequent insurrections. In 1852 the Charter of 1826, restored by Maria's government, was liberalized by important alterations, with the result that various parties were satisfied, and political life under her successor, Pedro V, was mild and orderly. His reign was uneventful. He was followed in 1861 by Louis I, and he in 1889 by Carlos I.

Death of Maria.

Of recent years radical parties, Republican, Socialist, have grown up. Discontent during this period expressed itself by deeds of violence. The Government replied by becoming more and more arbitrary. The King, Carlos I, even assumed to alter the Charter of 1826, still the basis of Portuguese political life, by mere decree. The controversy between Liberals, Radicals, and Conservatives developed astounding bitterness. Parliamentary institutions ceased to work normally, necessary legislation could not be secured. On February 1, 1908, the King and the Crown Prince were assassinated in the streets of Lisbon. His second

Recent events in Portugal.

son succeeded, and is at present King, Manuel II. Portugal evidently faces serious problems; monarchy itself is in danger. She is burdened with an immense debt, disproportionate to her resources, and entailing oppressive taxation. Her educational system is most inadequate. Her population is over five million. She has small colonial possessions in Asia and extensive ones in Africa, which have thus far proved of little value. The Azores and Madeira are not colonies but are integral parts of the kingdom.

CHAPTER XXV

HOLLAND AND BELGIUM SINCE 1830

HOLLAND

Holland.

We have described the dismemberment of the Kingdom of the Netherlands in 1830, and the years succeeding. That kingdom, which included what we know as Holland and Belgium, was the work of the Congress of Vienna, created as a bulwark against France. The Belgians had revolted, and, supported in the end by some of the great powers, had won their independence. Since then there have been two kingdoms.

The old Dutch provinces preserved the name henceforth of the Kingdom of the Netherlands. This kingdom, more frequently called Holland in English-speaking countries, has had a history of comparatively quiet internal development, and has played no important rôle in international politics. It has passed through several reigns, that of William I, from 1814 to 1840; of William II, from 1840 to 1849; of William III, from 1849 to 1890, and of Queen Wilhelmina since 1890. The questions of greatest prominence in her separate history have been those concerning constitutional liberties, educational policy, and colonial administration.

The Fundamental Law of 1815.

The political system rested upon the Fundamental Law granted by William I in 1815. By this the kingdom became a constitutional monarchy, but a monarchy in which the king was more powerful than the parliament, or States-General. By that law, the States-General were composed of two chambers, one of which consisted of members appointed for life by the king, the other of members chosen by the estates of the provinces, which themselves were chosen

by voters meeting a certain property qualification. The legislative power of the States-General was restricted to the acceptance and rejection of bills submitted by the Government. They had no powers of origination or of amendment. The budget was voted for a period of years; the civil service was beyond their control. The ministry was not responsible to them, but to the king alone.

Such a system was an advance upon absolutism, but it left the king extensive powers, not easily or adequately controlled, and rendered possible the personal government of William I, which ended in the revolt of the Belgians in 1830. The Liberals of Holland demanded that this system should be radically changed, and that thenceforth the emphasis should be laid upon parliament, and that parliament should be brought into closer connection with the people. After an agitation of several years they were rewarded with a considerable measure of success. A revision of the constitution was made by a commission appointed by the King, and was adopted by an extraordinary States-General in 1848, the general revolutionary tendency of that time no doubt facilitating the change. By the revised Constitution of 1848 the power of the king was diminished, that of parliament greatly increased. The Upper House was no longer to be appointed by the monarch, but elected by the provincial estates. The Lower House was to be chosen directly by the voters, that is, those who paid a certain property tax, varying according to locality. The ministers were made responsible to the States-General, which also acquired the right to initiate legislation, to amend projects submitted, and to vote the budget annually. Their sessions became public. Later reforms reorganized the provincial estates. Holland is divided into eleven provinces, each with its estates. The principle at the basis of these, of division into orders, or estates, was abolished. They were henceforth to be elected directly by those who were entitled to vote for the popular chamber of the States-General. Properly speak-

The Constitution of 1848.

ing, they ceased to be estates, and became legislatures in the modern sense, though the old name was preserved. Since 1848 the constitution has been subjected to slight amendments, one of the more important being the enlargement in 1887 of the electorate and the extension of the suffrage practically to householders and lodgers, as in England. This increased the number of voters from about 140,000 to about 300,000. By a later reform, voted in 1896, increasing the variety of property qualifications, the number was augmented to about 700,000, or one for every seven inhabitants. Universal suffrage, demanded by Socialists and Liberals, has not been granted.

Extension of the franchise.

The Kingdom of the Netherlands possesses extensive colonies in the East Indies and the West Indies. Of these the most important is Java. Sumatra, Borneo, Celebes in Asia, Curaçao and Surinam or Dutch Guiana in America, are valuable possessions. The Dutch colonial empire has a population of about 38,000,000, compared with a population of about 6,000,000 in the Netherlands themselves. The colonies are of great importance commercially, furnishing tropical commodities in large quantities, sugar, coffee, pepper, tea, tobacco, and indigo.

The Dutch Colonies.

BELGIUM

The constitution adopted by the Belgians in 1831, at the time of their separation from Holland, is still the basis of the state. It established an hereditary monarchy, a parliament of two chambers, and a ministry responsible to it. The King, Leopold I, scrupulously observed the methods of parliamentary government from the outset, choosing his ministers from the party having the majority in the chambers. Leopold's reign lasted from 1831 to his death in 1865. It was one of peaceful development. Institutions essential to the welfare of the people were founded. Though the neutrality of Belgium was guaranteed by the powers, it was nevertheless essential that she should herself have force

The reign of Leopold I.

enough to maintain her neutrality. The army was, consequently, organized and put upon a war basis of 100,000 men. State universities were founded, and primary and secondary schools were opened in large numbers. Legislation favorable to industry and commerce was adopted. Railroads were built. Liberty of religion, of the press, of association, of education, was guaranteed by the Constitution. Foreign relations were prudently conducted by Leopold I, whose influence with other rulers of Europe was great, owing to his extensive acquaintance with European statesmen, his knowledge of politics, his sureness of judgment. Under Leopold I Belgium's material and intellectual development was rapid.

The suffrage.

He was succeeded in 1865 by his son, Leopold II, who ruled for forty-four years. The two most important political questions during most of this period have concerned the suffrage and the schools. The suffrage was limited by a comparatively high property qualification, with the result that in 1890 there were only about 135,000 voters out of a population of six millions. As the cities had grown rapidly, and as the working classes were practically disfranchised, the demand for universal suffrage became increasingly clamorous until it could no longer be ignored. In 1893 the Constitution was revised, and the suffrage greatly enlarged. Every man of twenty-five years of age, not disqualified for some special reason, received the franchise. But supplementary votes were given to those who, in addition to the age qualification, could meet certain property qualifications. This is the principle of plural voting, and was designed to give the propertied classes more weight than they would have from numbers alone. It was provided that no voter should have more than three votes. This form of suffrage is strongly opposed by the Socialists, a growing party which has attempted to secure the recognition of the principle of "one man, one vote," but has not thus far been successful.

Education.

The political parties of most importance have been the Liberal and the Catholic. The Catholics have struggled to gain sectarian religious instruction in the schools, and have in great measure succeeded. Their opponents desire unsectarian schools.

Belgium is the most densely populated country in Europe. Its population of more than seven millions is overwhelmingly Roman Catholic. It possesses one colony, the former Congo Free State, transformed into a colony in 1908.

Leopold II died December 17, 1909, and was succeeded by his nephew Albert I.

CHAPTER XXVI

SWITZERLAND

Switzerland in 1815 was a loose confederation of twenty-two states or cantons.[1] These varied greatly in their forms of government. A few were real democracies, the people meeting *en masse* at stated periods, generally in some meadow or open place, to enact laws and to elect officials to execute them. But these were the smaller and poorer cantons. In others, the government was not democratic, but was representative. In some of these political power was practically monopolized by a group of important families, the patricians; in others by the propertied class. Most of the cantons, therefore, were not democratic, but were governed by privileged classes. The central government consisted of a Diet, which really was a congress of ambassadors, who voted according to the instructions given them by the cantons that sent them. In the language of political science, Switzerland was not a federal state, but was only a federation of states. Its constitution was the Pact of 1815, which was the work of a convention which met in Zurich and whose deliberations continued from April 1814 to August 1815. Switzerland did not have a capital. The Diet sat alternately in three leading cities, Bern, Zurich, and Lucerne.

The Constitution of 1815.

The importance of the cantons.

In Swiss institutions, therefore, the emphasis was put upon the cantons, not upon the confederation. This had been the case during the five hundred years of Swiss history, save during a short period of French domination under

[1] Three of these were divided into "half-cantons," thus making in all twenty-five cantonal governments. A "half-canton" has the same powers in local government as has a whole canton. In federal affairs, however, it has only half the weight. Vincent, Government in Switzerland, 40.

the Directory, and under Napoleon. The cantons retained all powers that were not expressly granted to the Diet. They had their own postal systems, their own coinage. A person was a citizen of a canton, not of Switzerland. Leaving his canton, he was a man without a country. Cantons might make commercial treaties with foreign powers. The Pact of 1815 said nothing about the usual liberties of the press, of public meeting, of religion. These matters were, therefore, left in the hands of the cantons, which legislated as they chose, in some cases very illiberally. Several possessed established churches, and did not allow any others. Valais did not permit Protestant worship, Vaud did not permit Catholic. Education was entirely a cantonal affair. Most of the cantons were neither democratic nor liberal, and it remained for the future to accomplish the unification of these petty states.

For about fifteen years after 1815 most of the cantons followed generally reactionary policies. Then began the period which the Swiss call the era of regeneration, in which the constitutions of many of the cantons were liberalized by the recognition of the classes hitherto excluded from power, and now becoming clamorous. The cantonal governments were wise enough to make the concessions demanded, such as universal suffrage, freedom of the press, equality before the law, before discontent appealed to force. Between 1830 and 1847 there were nearly thirty revisions of cantonal constitutions.

The "Era of Regeneration."

The same party which demanded liberal cantonal constitutions demanded a stronger central government. This, however, was not effected so easily, but only after a short civil war, the war of the *Sonderbund*.

As each canton possessed control of religion and education, it had come about that in the seven Catholic cantons the Jesuits had gained great influence, which they were striving to increase. The Radical party stood for liberty of religion, secular education, a lay state. It wished to increase

the power of the central government, so that it might impose its views upon the whole confederation. For this reason the Catholic cantons were opposed to any increase of the federal power, and wished to maintain the authority of the cantons untouched, for only thus could they maintain their views. Religious and political passions finally rose so high that in 1847 the seven Catholic cantons formed a special league (*Sonderbund*), for the purpose of protecting the interests which they considered threatened. They regarded their action as merely defensive against possible attack. The Radicals were, however, able to get a vote through the Diet ordering the disbandment of this league. As the members of the league refused to disband, a war resulted (1847). It was of brief duration and was over in three weeks. The victory, which did not cost many lives, was easily won by the forces of the federal government, which were much more numerous and better equipped than those of the league. The *Sonderbund* was dissolved, the Jesuits were expelled, and the triumphant Radicals proceeded to carry out their cherished plan of strengthening the federal government. This they accomplished by the Constitution of 1848, which superseded the Pact of 1815. This constitution, with some changes, is still in force. It transformed Switzerland into a true federal union, resembling, in many respects, the United States. The Diet of ambassadors gave way to a representative body with extensive powers of legislation.

The Sonderbund.

The Constitution of 1848.

The Federal Government.

The federal legislature was henceforth to consist of two houses: the National Council, elected directly by the people, one member for every 20,000 inhabitants; and the Council of States, composed of two members for each canton. In the former, population counts; in the latter, the equality of the cantons is preserved. The two bodies sitting together choose the Federal Tribunal, and also a committee of seven, the Federal Council to serve as the executive. From this committee of seven they elect each year one who acts as its chairman and whose title is "President of the

Swiss Confederation," but whose power is no greater than that of any of the other members. It was recognized that there should be a single capital, and Bern was chosen as such, on account of its position on the border of the German- and French-speaking districts.

Powers of the federal and cantonal governments.

Larger powers were now given to the confederation: the control of foreign affairs, the army, tariffs, the postal system, and the coinage. The cantons retain great powers, such as the right to legislate concerning civil and criminal matters, religion, and education.

The new constitution was ratified by three-fourths of the cantons and two-thirds of the voters, and was put immediately into force. It converted an ancient league of states into a strong federal union. It created for the first time in history a real Swiss nation. This is one of the triumphs of the nationalistic spirit, of which Europe has seen so many in the nineteenth century. It is also a triumph of another of the motive forces of the century, the democratic spirit. The reform of the federal constitution in a manner satisfactory to the democratic demands of the time was only possible after a reform in the cantons in the direction of democracy. The cantonal reform movement of the decade preceding 1848 was the condition precedent to the Constitution of 1848.

The chief significance of Switzerland.

Since 1848 Switzerland has pursued a course of peaceful development, but one of extraordinary interest to the outside world. This interest consists not in great events, not in foreign policy, for Switzerland has constantly preserved a strict neutrality, but in the steady and thoroughgoing evolution of certain political forms which may be of great value to all self-governing countries. There have been developed in Switzerland certain processes of law-making the most democratic in character known to the world. The achievement has been so remarkable, the process so uninterrupted, that it merits description.

In all countries calling themselves democratic, the political

machinery is representative, not direct, i.e., the voters do not make the laws themselves, but merely at certain periods choose people, their representatives, who make them. These laws are not ratified or rejected by the voters; they never come before the voters directly. But the Swiss have sought, and with great success, to render the voters law-makers themselves, and not the mere choosers of law-makers, to apply the power of the democracy to the national life at every point, and constantly. They have done this in various ways. Their methods have been first worked out in the cantons, and later in the confederation.

Important contributions to democratic government.

The Landesgemeinde cantons.

Some of the smaller cantons have from time immemorial been pure democracies. The voters have met together at stated times, usually in the open air, and have elected their officials, and by a show of hands have voted the laws. There are six such cantons to-day. Such direct government is possible, because these cantons are small both in area and population. They are so small that no voter has more than fifteen miles to go to the voting place, and most have a much shorter distance. These mass meetings or *Landesgemeinden* are not unwieldy, varying from 2,000 to 10,000.

But in the other cantons this method does not prevail. In them the people elect representative assemblies, as in England and the United States, but they exercise a control over them not exercised in these countries, and which renders self-government almost as complete as in the six cantons described above. They do this by the so-called referendum and initiative. In the cantons where these processes are in vogue the people do not, as in the *Landesgemeinde* cantons, come together in mass meeting and enact their own laws. They elect, as in other countries, their own legislature, which enacts the laws. The government is representative, not democratic. But the action of the legislature is not final, only to be altered, if altered at all, by a succeeding legislature. Laws passed by the cantonal legislature may or must be referred to the people (referendum), who then have

The referendum.

the right to reject or accept them, who, in other words, become the law-makers, their legislature being simply a kind of committee to help them by suggesting measures and by drafting them. The referendum is of two kinds, optional and obligatory. The optional referendum requires that a law must be submitted to popular vote if a certain number of the voters petition for it. The proportion varies in the different cantons, ranging from a twelfth to a fifth of all the voters. The obligatory referendum requires, as the name implies, that all laws, or certain kinds of laws, shall be submitted without the need of petition. The obligatory form is the more democratic, requiring, as it does, a direct popular vote on every law.

The initiative.

The initiative, on the other hand, enables a certain number of voters to propose a law or a principle of legislation and to require that the legislature submit the proposal to the people, even though it is itself opposed to it.[1] If ratified the proposal becomes law. The initiative thus reverses the order of the process. The impulse to the making of a new law comes from the people, not from the legislature. The referendum is negative and preventative. It is the veto power given to the people. The initiative is positive, originative, constructive. By these two processes a democracy makes whatever laws it pleases. The one is the complement of the other. They do not abolish legislatures, but they give the people control whenever a sufficient number wish to exercise it. The constitution of the canton of Zurich expresses the relation as follows: "The people exercise the law-making power with the assistance of the state legislature." The legislature is not the final law-making body. The voters are the supreme legislators. These two devices, the referendum and the initiative, are intended to establish, and do establish, government of the people, and by the people. They are of immense interest to all who wish

[1] The number is about the same, in proportion to the whole number of voters, as is required in the case of the optional referendum.

to make the practice of democracy correspond to the theory. By them Switzerland has more nearly approached democracy than has any other country.

Spread of the referendum and the initiative.

This system has been mainly developed since 1848, though its beginnings may be found earlier. Its growth constitutes the most important feature of Swiss political history in the last half century. It has been adopted wholly or in part in all of the representative cantons, with the exception of Freiburg. It has also been introduced into the federal government. In 1874 the federal constitution was revised, and at that time the federal referendum was established, and since 1891 a kind of federal initiative exists, that is, the people have the right to initiate constitutional amendments, not ordinary laws, but, as no sharp line separates the two, the power is practically unrestricted.

The Swiss have not only sought by these devices to subordinate the representative system to the higher will of the people, but they have at the same time sought to perfect that system itself by making it a more exact expression of that will. The method advocated to accomplish this

Proportional representation.

is proportional representation, by which minorities are given weight in legislatures in proportion to their numbers. This system has been adopted in several cantons, and its advocates urge its adoption in the others, and in the confederation.[1]

From being decentralized and undemocratic in 1815 Switzerland has achieved during the century a considerable degree of centralization, and has become the most democratic country in the world. It has made great progress in education and in industry.

The population of Switzerland.

The population has increased over a million since 1850, and now numbers about three and a half millions. This population is not homogeneous in race or language. About 71 per cent. speak German, 21 per cent. French, 5 per cent. Italian, and a small fraction speak a peculiar Romance language, called Roumansch. But

[1] Vincent, Government in Switzerland, 75-83.

language is not a divisive force, as it is elsewhere, as it is, for example, in Austria-Hungary and in the Balkan peninsula, probably because no political advantages or disadvantages are connected with it.

The neutrality of Switzerland is guaranteed by the powers. From this fact, as well as from its central position, Switzerland has come to play a unique and important part in international affairs. It has become the seat of a number of useful international institutions—the Red Cross Society, whose flag is the Swiss flag with colors reversed; the International Postal Union, the International Telegraph Union. It has also played an important rôle in the international peace movement. It was in Geneva, in 1872, that the most important work of international arbitration of the nineteenth century was accomplished, that which settled the controversy between the United States and Great Britain which grew out of the *Alabama* claims.

The neutrality of Switzerland.

CHAPTER XXVII

THE SCANDINAVIAN STATES

DENMARK

During the later wars of Napoleon Denmark had been his ally, remaining loyal to the end, while other allies had taken favorable occasion to abandon him. For this conduct the conquerors of Napoleon punished her severely by forcing her by the Treaty of Kiel, January 1814, to cede Norway to Sweden, which had thrown in its lot with the Great Coalition. The condition of the Danish kingdom at the period of the opening of this history was deplorable, indeed. By the loss of Norway her population was reduced a third. Her trade was ruined, and her finances were in the greatest disorder.

Denmark loses Norway.

The Government was an absolute monarchy. Frederick VI was king from 1808 to 1839. Down to 1830 there was practically no political activity. The people were struggling to recover some measure of prosperity, the Government was forced to pursue a quiet economical policy of routine to provide for the urgent needs of the state. The great war debt weighed heavily upon the nation. Not for a generation was it found possible to begin to reduce it.

But after 1830 a liberal movement developed of sufficient strength to necessitate some action on the part of the King. Thinking to quiet it by mild concessions, he established in 1834 four consultative estates—one for each of the provinces into which Denmark was divided—the Islands, Jutland, Schleswig, and Holstein. These assemblies were to be chosen for six years by the landed proprietors, and were to meet biennially. They were to have the power to discuss laws and taxes, to present petitions, to criticise the Govern-

Consultative assemblies.

ment. But they had no real authority, as they were merely consultative. The king might follow their advice, or accede to their petitions, or not, as he chose. Their meetings were behind closed doors, and their debates were not published.

Obviously, such assemblies did not at all satisfy the demands of the Liberals, who desired a real constitution and a real parliament. This party had high hopes that the succeeding king, Christian VIII, who ruled from 1839 to 1848, and who came to the throne with a reputation for enlightened and progressive ideas, would launch Denmark upon a career of liberalism, but their hopes were entirely disappointed. The agitation, therefore, continued, and grew so strong that Christian finally decided to grant a constitution, but he died before promulgating it.

Constitution granted.

His successor, Frederick VII, issued a constitution in June 1849, which was limited to the Islands and Jutland, and did not include the duchies, Schleswig and Holstein. In 1854 Frederick promulgated another constitution, and in 1855 still another. The difficulty was that the question of a constitution was bound up with that vastly complicated problem of the relation of the duchies, Schleswig and Holstein, to Denmark. This problem of the duchies dominated Danish politics during the entire reign of Frederick VII, from 1848 to 1863, never solved, and always highly disturbing. Under his successor, Christian IX, who reigned from 1863 to 1906, the problem entered upon its final phase, leading, as we have seen elsewhere, to the war of 1864 between Denmark on the one hand and Prussia and Austria on the other. The result of that war was the loss of the duchies to the two powers by the Treaty of Vienna, October 30, 1864. The question of the duchies was thus settled as far as Denmark was concerned. For the second time in the nineteenth century Denmark suffered a dismemberment at the hands of the great military powers. This reduced her territorial extent by a third, her population by about a million.

Schleswig-Holstein.

Treaty of Vienna.

Since that war Denmark has pursued a policy of internal development, undisturbed by foreign politics. A constitution was issued in 1866, a revision of that of 1849, and is still in force. By it a parliament of two houses was established, the Upper House or Landsthing, consisting of 66 members, twelve of whom are appointed by the king for life, the others being chosen by the large taxpayers for a term of eight years; and the Lower House, or Folkething, elected for three years by a wide suffrage. According to the constitution there should be one member for every 16,000 inhabitants. There are, however, at present only 114 members.

Revision of the Constitution.

For many years Christian IX ruled, relying on the Upper House in defiance of the wishes of the Lower. The dispute was over army reform and the budget, and the example followed was that of Bismarck in Prussia between 1862 and 1866. In the end the King was victorious. Constitutional government during these years (1873-1894) really existed only in name. Latterly, the Radical party has increased, and in 1901 it gained an overwhelming victory. Recent legislation has been along radical lines. In 1891 an old age pension system was established. All over sixty years, of good character, are entitled to a pension, half of which is paid by the state, half by the local authority. There is no requirement of previous payments on the part of the recipients, as there is in Germany. The suffrage is possessed by men of at least thirty years of age. Women have recently secured the right to vote in city and town elections, and are agitating to secure the same right in national elections. Education is compulsory between the ages of seven and fourteen. The population of Denmark is over two million and a half. The area is about that of Switzerland.

Growth of radicalism.

Denmark has extensive possessions—Greenland, Iceland, the Faroe Islands, and the three small West Indian islands of St. Croix, St. Thomas, and St. John. Of these the most

Denmark's colonies.

important is Iceland, 600 miles west of Norway, with an area of over 40,000 square miles and a population of about 80,000. Iceland was granted home rule in 1874, and has its own parliament of thirty-six members. In 1874 Iceland celebrated the thousandth anniversary of its settlement. The Faroes are not colonies, but parts of the kingdom.

The present king is Frederick VIII, who has been on the throne since 1906.

SWEDEN AND NORWAY

Both Sweden and Norway were affected by the course of the Napoleonic wars. After the Treaty of Tilsit of 1807, by which Russia and France became allies, Russia proceeded to gratify a long cherished ambition by seizing Finland from Sweden, thus gaining a large territory and a long coast line on the Baltic Sea. Later, Sweden, uniting with the Allies against Napoleon, was rewarded in 1814 by the acquisition of Norway, torn from Denmark, which had adhered to Napoleon to the end, and which was accordingly considered a proper subject for punishment.

The Norwegians had not been consulted in this transaction. They were regarded as a negligible quantity, a passive pawn in the international game, a conception that proved erroneous, for no sooner did they hear that they were being handed by outsiders from Denmark to Sweden than they protested, and proceeded to organize resistance. Claiming that the Danish King's renunciation of the crown of Norway restored that crown to themselves, they proceeded to elect a king of their own, May 17, 1814, and they adopted a liberal constitution, the Constitution of Eidsvold, establishing a parliament, or Storthing.

The Constitution of Eidsvold.

But the King of Sweden, to whom this country had been assigned by the consent of the powers, did not propose to be deprived of it by act of the Norwegians themselves. He sent the Crown Prince, Bernadotte, into Norway to take possession. A war resulted between the Swedes and the

Norwegians, the latter being victorious. Then the great powers intervened so peremptorily that the newly elected Norwegian king, Christian, resigned his crown into the hands of the Storthing. The Storthing then acquiesced in the union with Sweden, but only after having formally elected the King of Sweden as the King of Norway, thus asserting its sovereignty, and also after the King had promised to recognize the Constitution of 1814, which the Norwegians had given themselves.

Sweden and Norway separate nations under the same king.

Thus there was no fusion of Norway and Sweden. There were two kingdoms and one king. The same person was King of Sweden and King of Norway, but he governed each according to its own laws, and by means of separate ministries. No Swede could hold office in Norway, no Norwegian in Sweden. Each country had its separate constitution, its separate parliament. In Sweden the parliament, or Diet, consisted of four houses, representing respectively the nobility, the clergy, the cities, and the peasantry. In Norway the parliament, or Storthing, consisted of two chambers. Sweden had a strong aristocracy, Norway only a small and feeble one. Swedish government and society were aristocratic and feudal, Norwegian very democratic. Norway, indeed, was a land of peasants, who owned their farms, and fisherfolk, sturdy, simple, independent. Each country had its own language, each its own capital, that of Sweden at Stockholm, that of Norway at Christiania.

The two kingdoms, therefore, were very dissimilar, with their different languages, different institutions, and different conditions. They had in common a king, and ministers of war and foreign affairs. The connection between the two countries, limited as it was, led during the century to frequent and bitter disagreements, ending a few years ago in their final separation.

The reign of Charles XIII.

Charles XIII, the ruler in 1815, having no son, had adopted the French marshal, Bernadotte, as Crown Prince. Bernadotte became king in 1818, and ruled as Charles XIV

until his death in 1844. Under him only slight changes were made in the institutions of Sweden. He was opposed to reforms, and earnest in his resistance to the liberal parties. In an economic sense the prosperity of Sweden advanced considerably. Religious freedom was established. The debt was reduced. But the King would not consent to the chief demand of reformers for a radical change in the antiquated form of the Diet. Its division into four chambers played directly into his hands, as he could generally oppose one or two chambers to the others, thus himself exercising an authority practically free from control. The situation remained unchanged under his successor, Oscar I (1844-1859). Under Charles XV, however (1859-1872), this fundamental change was accomplished by the constitutional laws of 1866. The Diet was transformed into a modern parliament, consisting of two chambers. Representation by orders was abolished. Henceforth, there was to be an Upper Chamber, elected by communal councils for a term of nine years. As a high property qualification was required for membership, and as members of this house received no salaries, it really represented the noble and rich classes. The Lower Chamber was elected for three years, but, as a fairly high property qualification was required for voters, it also represented property. Indeed, only about eight per cent. of the people possessed the suffrage under this constitution. Members of this Chamber received salaries. This system went into force in 1866, and remained in force until 1909.

The Constitution of 1866.

Under the next king, Oscar II, who ruled from 1872 to 1907, the relations with Norway became acute, ending finally in complete rupture. Friction between Norway and Sweden has existed ever since 1814, and has provoked frequent crises. The fundamental cause has lain in the different conceptions prevalent among the two peoples as to the real nature of the union effected in that year. The Swedes have maintained that Norway was unqualifiedly ceded to

Friction between Sweden and Norway.

them by the Treaty of Kiel in 1814; that they later were willing to recognize that the Norwegians should have a certain amount of independence; that they, nevertheless, possessed certain rights in Norway and preponderance in the Union. The Norwegians, on the other hand, have maintained that the Union rested, not upon the Treaty of Kiel, a treaty between Denmark and Sweden, but upon their own act; that they had been independent, and had drawn up a constitution for themselves, the Constitution of Eidsvold; that they had voluntarily united themselves with Sweden by freely electing the King of Sweden as King of Norway; that there was no fusion of the two states; that Sweden had no power in Norway; that Sweden had no preponderance in the Union, but that the two states were on a plane of entire equality. With two such dissimilar views friction could not fail to develop, and it began immediately after 1814 on a question of trivial importance. The Norwegians insisted upon celebrating as their national holiday May 17th, the date of their adoption of the Constitution of Eidsvold. The Swedes wished it to be November 4th, the day on which the King, Charles XIII, accepted and promulgated that constitution. The Norwegians then, in 1815, intended to manage their own internal affairs as they saw fit, without any intermixture of Swedish influence. But their King was also King of Sweden, and, as a matter of fact, lived in Sweden most of the time, and was rarely seen in Norway. Moreover, Sweden was in population much the larger partner in this uncomfortable union.

By the Constitution of Eidsvold the King had only a suspensive veto over the laws of the Storthing, the Norwegian parliament. Any law could be enacted over that veto if passed by three successive Storthings, with intervals of three years between the votes. The process was slow, but sufficient to insure victory in any cause in which the Norwegians were in earnest. It was thus, that, despite the King's veto, they carried through the abolition of the Nor-

wegian nobility. Contests between the Storthing and the King of Norway, occurring from time to time, over the question of the national flag, of annual sessions, and other matters, kept alive the antipathy of the Norwegians to the Union. Meanwhile, their prosperity increased. Particularly did they develop an important commerce. One-fourth of the merchant marine of the continent of Europe passed gradually into their hands. This gave rise to a question more serious than any that had hitherto arisen—that of the consular service.

Abolition of Norwegian nobility.

About 1892 began a fateful discussion over the question of the consular service. The Norwegian Parliament demanded a separate consular service for Norway, to be conducted by itself, to care for Norway's commercial interests, so much more important than those of Sweden. This the King would not grant, on the ground that it would break up the Union, that Sweden and Norway could not have two foreign policies. The conflict thus begun dragged on for years, embittering the relations of the Norwegians and the Swedes, and inflaming passions until in 1905 (June 7th) the Norwegian Parliament declared unanimously "that the Union with Sweden under one king has ceased." The war feeling in Sweden was strong, but the Government finally decided, in order to avoid the evils of a conflict, to recognize the dissolution of the Union, on condition that the question of separation should be submitted to the people of Norway. Sweden held that there was no proof that the Norwegian people desired this, but was evidently of the opinion that the whole crisis was simply the work of the Storthing. That such an opinion was erroneous was established by the vote on August 13, 1905, which showed over 368,000 in favor of separation and only 184 votes in opposition. A conference was then held at Carlstad to draw up a treaty or agreement of dissolution. This agreement provided that any disputes arising in the future between the two countries, which could not be settled by direct diplomatic negotiations,

Dissolution of the Union.

Treaty of Carlstad.

should be referred to the Hague International Arbitration Tribunal. It further provided for the establishment of a neutral zone along the frontiers of the two countries, on which no military fortifications should ever be erected.

Later in the year the Norwegians chose Prince Charles of Denmark, grandson of the then King of Denmark, as King of Norway. There was a strong feeling in favor of a republic, but it seemed clear that the election of a king would be more acceptable to the monarchies of Europe, and would avoid all possibilities of foreign intervention. The new king assumed the name of Haakon VII, thus indicating the historical continuity of the independent kingdom of Norway, which had grown up in the Middle Ages. He took up his residence in Christiania.

Death of Oscar II.

On December 8, 1907, Oscar II, since 1905 King of Sweden only, died, and was succeeded by his son as Gustavus V.

In 1909 Sweden took a long step toward democracy. A franchise reform bill, which had long been before parliament, was finally passed. Manhood suffrage was established for the Lower House, and the qualifications for election to the Upper House were reduced to the point that those enjoying an income of about $1,800 a year are eligible.

Suffrage in Norway.

In Norway, men who have reached the age of twenty-five, and who have been residents of the country for five years, have the right to vote. By a constitutional amendment adopted in 1907 the right to vote for members of the Storthing was granted to women, who meet the same qualifications, and who, in addition, pay, or whose husbands pay, a tax upon an income ranging from about seventy-five dollars in the country to about one hundred dollars in cities. About 300,000 of the 550,000 Norwegian women of the age of twenty-five, or older, thus secured the suffrage. They had previously enjoyed the suffrage in local elections.

Sweden has a population of about five and a half million; Norway of less than two and a half million.

CHAPTER XXVIII

THE DISRUPTION OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE AND THE RISE OF THE BALKAN STATES

The Ottoman Empire, although it had been for a long time diminishing in size and in importance, was still very extensive in 1815. In Asia it included Asia Minor, Syria, the region of the Euphrates up to Persia, and the suzerainty of Arabia; in Africa, it comprised Egypt and the northern coast of the continent as far as Morocco. In Europe it possessed the whole of the Balkan peninsula, and north of the Danube the principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia. It stretched, therefore, like a huge crescent round the eastern and southern shores of the Mediterranean from the Adriatic nearly to Spain. This vast empire had been for some time in danger of being conquered by foreign powers. Russia had, since the time of Catharine II, been pushing her way southward, by seizing Turkish soil. At one time it seemed as if Russia and Austria, her two nearest neighbors, would divide the spoils between them, at another that Napoleon would direct his restless activity thither with damaging results. But the interests of European politics had kept these powers otherwise occupied, and had frustrated whatever designs they had had upon the Sultan's possessions. But there was another menace. The immediate danger was not from without but from within. The government of the Sultan was inefficient, its mechanism of control of its agents deplorably defective. The result was that in various parts of the empire those agents were using their power to found for themselves virtually independent states, with themselves and their children as the royal lines. A process of dismemberment was going on in Turkey such as had gone on

Decay of the Ottoman Empire.

Turkey in process of dismemberment.

in Germany in the Middle Ages under the feudal system. A large but loosely organized state was being broken up by the personal cupidity and ambition of its agents into small, compact, and energetic states. Thus Algiers and Tunis were only nominally parts of the empire, and the bond of vassalage attaching them to the empire was not in 1815 recognized by Europe. The Beys were real sovereigns. Thus, in Egypt, Mehemet Ali was really founding an independent monarchy, and his son, Ibrahim, was already chosen as his successor. The process had even reached European Turkey, and, in Albania, Ali of Janina was endeavoring to accomplish the same thing. The military system of the empire, once the terror of Europe, was now in decay, both in discipline, in leadership, and in equipment. The main object for a century had been defense, and not offense, and even that was beyond the competence of the government.

This empire rested on a fundamental principle which, in the nineteenth century, was to prove a source of great weakness. Difference of religious belief was made the basis of the state. The population was divided into two classes, the Mohammedans and those who were not Mohammedans. The government had never attempted to fuse the two elements, but rather had always sharply differentiated them. The Mohammedans were the ruling class, and they were contemptuous of the others, to whom they applied the name rayahs, that is, unprotected herds destined only to serve.

The ruling class.

That part of the Ottoman Empire which lay in Europe was the smallest part by far, yet it has had the most eventful history and has furnished one of the most intricate and contentious problems European statesmen have ever had to consider, the so-called Eastern Question. The Turks in their conquest of southeastern Europe in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries had subdued many different races; the Greeks, claiming descent from the Greeks of antiquity; the Roumanians, claiming descent from Roman colonists of the empire; the Albanians, and various branches of the great

The Eastern Question.

Slavic race, the Servians, Bulgarians,[1] Bosnians, and Montenegrins. Full of contempt for those whom they had conquered, the Turks made no attempt to assimilate them nor to fuse them into one body politic. They were satisfied with reducing them to subjection, and with exploiting them. They left them in a kind of semi-independence as far as administration was concerned, allowing them to retain their civil laws and their local magistrates. These subject peoples were permitted the free exercise of their religion which, for most of them, was the Greek form of Christianity, but they were despised. While they enjoyed certain privileges they possessed no rights. Their property might be confiscated, their lives taken in some moment of anger or suspicion or cupidity on the part of their rulers. They were flocks to be sheared, rayahs, victims of a government that was arbitrary, rapacious, capricious, and unrestrained. These Christian peoples were effaced for several centuries beneath Mussulman oppression. They bore their ills with resignation as long as they thought it impossible to resist the oppression, yet they never acquiesced in their position. The Turks neither crushed nor conciliated. The subject peoples kept their own organizations which sometime might be used as weapons. There were two causes always present which might at any moment bring about a conflagration, race hatred and religious animosity. There were other forces, also, active from time to time, but these were always present and were alone sufficient to render the Turkish government insecure. The decay of the Ottoman Empire, the rise of Russia, and the vast fame of the French Revolution seemed to indicate that the time had come

Treatment of subject peoples.

[1] The Bulgars, whose name is perpetuated in that of the present Kingdom of Bulgaria, were not a Slavic people but a Turanian or Tatar, akin to the Magyars and Turks. Crossing to the south of the Danube in the second half of the seventh century, they conquered a Slavic people previously settled there. But the same thing happened to them that happened to other barbarian invaders. They were assimilated by their subjects, whose language, moreover, they adopted. In language, in religion, in sympathies and aspirations they are Slavs.

The revolt of the Servians.

for revolt. The Servians were the first to rise,—in 1804 under Kara George, a swineherd. The Turks were driven from Servia for a time, but they regained it in 1813. The Servians again arose, and in 1820, Milosch Obrenovitch, who had instigated the murder of Kara George in 1817, and who thus became leader himself, secured from the Sultan the title of "Prince of the Servians of the Pashalik of Belgrade." His policy henceforth was directed to the acquisition of complete autonomy for Servia. This, after long negotiations and strongly supported by Russia, he achieved in 1830, when a decree of the Sultan bestowed upon him the title of "Hereditary Prince of the Servians." Thus, after many years of war and negotiations, Servia had ceased to be a mere Turkish province, and had become a principality tributary to the Sultan, but autonomous, and with a princely house ruling by right of heredity—the house of Obrenovitch which had succeeded in crushing the earlier house of Kara George. This was the first state to arise in the nineteenth century out of the dismemberment of European Turkey. Its capital was Belgrade.

THE GREEK WAR OF INDEPENDENCE

The next of these subject peoples to rise against the hated oppressor was the Greeks. The Greeks had been submerged by the Turkish flood but not destroyed. In the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries they had experienced a great reinvigoration of their racial and national consciousness.

The condition of the Greeks.

Their condition in 1820 was better than it had been for centuries, their spirit was higher and less disposed to bend before Turkish arrogance, their prosperity was greater. There had occurred in the eighteenth century a remarkable intellectual revival, connected with the restoration and purification of the Greek language. The ancient language had become almost extinct for all practical purposes. It was used, indeed, by the clergy and by the learned, but

the masses spoke it in a corrupted form, a dialect sadly mixed with all sorts of extraneous elements. Koraes, a Greek scholar, sought to purify the language of the people so that it would be possible for modern Greeks to read and understand the ancient classics, that thus all might be bound together intellectually by a sense of the common inheritance of a splendid intellectual past. He was remarkably successful so that it has been said that what Luther's Bible did for Germany, Koraes's editions of the classics, with their prefaces in modern Greek, have done for Greece. By this work the national consciousness of the people was greatly stirred and vivified. This was shown graphically in the single fact that the Greeks ceased to call themselves Romans, Romaioi, as they had done for centuries, and began to call themselves Hellenes once more.

Intellectual revival.

As in Italy and Spain and Germany, disaffection with the existing state of things was fostered by secret societies. It was such a society, the *Hetairia Philike*, or association of friends, that began the Greek war of independence. This society was founded in 1814 after it had become clear that the Congress of Vienna would do nothing in behalf of the Christian subjects of the Sultan. Its object was the expulsion of the Turk from Europe, and the re-establishment of the old Greek Eastern Empire, which had centuries before been overthrown by the invading Ottomans. The society relied upon gaining the support of Russia because of Russia's evident interest in the downfall of the Turkish power as likely to contribute to her own aggrandizement; also because of religious sympathy. The Russians and the Greeks belonged to the same branch of Christians, and Russia looked upon herself, and was looked upon by others, as the natural defender of Greek Christians wherever they might be. The *Hetairia* increased with great rapidity from 1814-1820 until it included most prominent Greeks whether they lived in the Morea, in the Danubian provinces, in Constantinople, in Russia or elsewhere. By 1820 it was supposed to have

The Hetairia Philike.

about 80,000 members. Many of the members of this association were in the employ of the Tsar, a fact which gave great plausibility to its assertion that in the contest it was preparing it would receive the military aid of Russia. The association collected considerable sums of money, bought weapons, and only waited the favorable moment for beginning an insurrection against the Turks.

The Greek war of independence.

Thus there was extensive preparation for the war which began in 1821, and lasted until the Greeks had achieved their independence in 1829. During the first six years, from 1821-1827, the Greeks fought alone against the Turks. This period was followed by a period of foreign intervention. The war was one of utter atrocity on both sides, a war of extermination, a war not limited to the armies. Each side, when victorious, murdered large numbers of non-combatants, men, women, and children. The Greek war song, "The Turk shall live no longer, neither in Morea nor in the whole earth," shows the temper in which this people began its war of liberation. During the first few weeks they proved that this was intended to be no mere lyric but grim reality. The Turks who did not take refuge in the garrison towns were murdered with their families. The Turks immediately took their revenge. The Greeks in Constantinople were hunted down by the enraged Mohammedans, and on Easter Sunday, 1821, the Patriarch or head of the Greek Church, a great and revered dignitary of eighty years, was hanged in his ecclesiastical robes in front of the Cathedral, and various bishops were also hanged. Nothing could have more horrified the members of the Greek Church, who looked upon the Patriarch as Catholics look upon the Pope. Nothing could have so surely deepened the ferocity of the conflict. When the Greeks later took Tripolitza, hitherto the seat of Turkish government in the Morea, they rioted in fearful carnage for three days until few inhabitants were left alive, and a Greek leader could say "that as he rode from the gateway to the citadel his horse's hoofs never touched the ground."

The ferocity of the conflict.

The Turks replied by the blood-curdling massacre of Chios, whose inhabitants had long been favorably known for their culture, prosperity, and happiness. The statistics are but rough, but it is said that out of 90,000 inhabitants, 23,000 were massacred, and 43,000 sold as slaves.

Factional quarrels among the Greeks.

The war continued, ineffectually prosecuted by Turkey, which seemed at certain moments likely to crush the rebels completely, only to fail to do so by its own incompetence. This period was made still more wretched by the inability of the Greeks to work together harmoniously. Torn by violent factional quarrels, they were unable to gain any pronounced advantage. On the other hand, Turkey, unable to conquer by her own force, called upon the Pasha of Egypt, Mehemet Ali, for aid. This ruler had built up a strong, disciplined army, well-equipped and trained in European methods, a force far superior to any which the Sultan or the Greeks possessed. Under Ibrahim, the Pasha's son, an Egyptian army of 11,000 landed in the Morea early in 1825, and began a war of extermination. The Morea was rapidly conquered. The fall of Missolonghi after a remarkable siege lasting about a year (April 1825-April 1826), with the loss of almost all the inhabitants, and the capture the following year of Athens and the Acropolis, seemed to have completed the subjugation of Greece. Few places remained to be seized.

Foreign intervention.

From the extremity of their misfortune the Greeks were rescued by the decision of foreign powers finally to intervene. The sympathy of cultivated people had, from the first, been aroused for the country which had given intellectual freedom and distinction to the world, this Mother of the Arts, which was now making an heroic and romantic struggle for an independent and worthy life of her own. Everywhere Philhellenic Societies were formed under this inspiration of the memories of Ancient Greece. These societies, founded in France, Germany, Switzerland, England and the United States, sought to aid the insurgents by sending money, arms,

and volunteers, and by bringing pressure to bear upon the governments to intervene. Many men from western Europe joined the Greek armies. The most illustrious of these was Lord Byron, who gave his life for the idea of a free Greece, dying of fever at Missolonghi in 1824. As Greek fortunes waned this movement became more vigorous. The new king of Bavaria, Louis I, sent money and numerous officers. In France, Lafayette, Châteaubriand and others worked passionately for the Greek cause. Money, soldiers, arms, clothing were sent in abundance by these volunteer societies of the west. Yet all this would have been insufficient to rescue Greece had not the monarchs of Europe brought the immense authority and power of their governments to bear upon the problem. Year after year the governments had refused to move. Metternich was no more a friend of revolution against the infidel Sultan than of revolution against the Holy Alliance. He wished to leave the Christians of Turkey to their fate, to let this revolt burn itself out "beyond the pale of civilization." "Three or four hundred thousand individuals hanged, butchered, impaled down there, hardly count," he is reported to have said, and for several years he was able to prevent the Greeks from receiving the aid of any foreign government. But the Greeks, by holding out against all odds, gave time for changes to occur in the attitude of other countries.

Why England intervened.

England's foreign policy finally came under the direction of Canning, a firm friend of liberty abroad. Canning was opposed to the principles of the Holy Alliance. He also believed in the ultimate achievement of Greek independence, and he preferred to have the Greeks friendly to England rather than hostile. He also wished the preservation of the Turkish Empire as a bulwark against Russia in Eastern affairs. He did not wish Russia to intervene alone, and help the Greeks to independence, thus thereafter having the support of the new state. He was also influenced by the fact that English bankers had made heavy loans to the Greeks.

It would be wise for England to interfere and bring this tangled question to a close favorable to her interests rather than to leave it to further hazard.

Why Russia intervened.

In Russia there was a change of monarchs. Alexander I died in 1825, and was succeeded by Nicholas I. The new monarch did not consider himself bound to the policy of the Holy Alliance. As soon as he saw England likely to take a hand in the Eastern Question his interest was not to let her do it alone. Ought England to be permitted to preempt the favor of the Greeks which they had been only too willing all along to give to Russia? Nicholas was indignant at the prospect. Furthermore, the public opinion of Russia was overwhelmingly in favor of intervention to save the Greeks. The motive was not the same as in the western countries,—the desire to extend human liberty—the memory of Ancient Greece. The motive with the Russian masses was religious, a desire to prevent the Infidel of Constantinople from longer oppressing the members of the Orthodox Church to which they themselves belonged.

Why France intervened.

In France all parties, liberal and conservative, were united in favor of the Greeks,—the liberals because of the prospect of creating a new free state in Europe, and thus helping undermine the Holy Alliance, the royalists because they remembered the part the monarchy had played centuries before under Saint Louis in the Crusades against the infidels. Politicians also believed that here was a chance to raise the prestige of France in international affairs by the humiliation of Austria which would be one of the results.

Treaty of London.

Out of all these motives arose the Treaty of London of 1827. By this treaty the three powers, England, Russia and France, on the ground that the conflict was of general concern owing to the injuries inflicted upon commerce, agreed to demand an armistice of Mahmud II and his consent to the erection of Greece as an autonomous state under Turkish sovereignty, to be therefore practically in the same situation as Servia. The Sultan indignantly refused the arm-

istice. The three admirals of the allied fleet presented an ultimatum to Ibrahim, which was rejected. The consequence was a naval battle at Navarino, October 20, 1827, a battle which arose accidentally, but which ended in the destruction of the Turco-Egyptian fleet. The issue of Navarino was not the independence of Greece. The Allies had not intended to fight a battle with Turkey, but only to force an armistice upon the combatants, and then to compel recognition of the autonomy of Greece under the suzerainty of the Sultan. The effect of the battle was greatly to encourage the Greeks, to delight the liberals throughout Europe, but to exasperate the Turks to a point where they lost all prudence. The Sultan demanded that the allied powers make ample reparation for the indignity and the damage which they had inflicted upon him while they pretended to be at peace. This was refused, though the new English ministry, Canning having recently died, shortly pronounced the battle of Navarino an "untoward event." The recriminations became so heated that the ambassadors of the Allies left Constantinople. The Allies could agree upon no definite policy immediately after Navarino. England refused reparation yet regretted the incident because it seemed to her that by weakening the power of the Sultan she was playing directly into the hands of Russia. England's policy was hesitating, cloudy, and unwise. She made no attempt to impose the Treaty of London, and let matters drift.

The battle of Navarino.

Meanwhile, the Sultan, losing his self-control, called upon the faithful in a violent manifesto to take part in a holy war. This manifesto named Russia as the cause of the whole insurrection, and was full of venom. Russia desired nothing better than a war with Turkey, which she forthwith declared April 26, 1828.

War between Russia and Turkey.

This Russo-Turkish war lasted over a year. In the first campaign the Russians were unsuccessful, but, redoubling their efforts, and under better leadership, they crossed the

Balkans, and marched rapidly toward Constantinople. The French meanwhile had sent an army into the Morea, and had forced the Egyptian troops to leave the country and sail for Egypt. The Sultan was obliged to yield and the Treaty of Adrianople was signed with Russia September 14, 1829.

Creation of the Kingdom of Greece.

As the outcome of this series of events Greece became a kingdom, entirely independent of Turkey, its independence guaranteed by the three powers, Russia, England, and France. Russia gained a slight increase of territory in Asia, none in Europe. The Danubian principalities, Moldavia and Wallachia, were made practically, though not nominally, independent. The Sultan's power in Europe was therefore considerably reduced. In 1833, Otto, a lad of seventeen, second son of King Louis I of Bavaria, became the first King of Greece. A new Christian state had been created in southeastern Europe.

THE CRIMEAN WAR

Russia emerged from the Turkish war with increased prestige and power. It had been her campaign of 1829 that had brought the Sultan to terms. Greece had become independent, and was more grateful to her than to the other powers. Moldavia and Wallachia, still nominally a part of Turkey, were practically free of Turkish control, and Russian influence in them was henceforth paramount. Several years later Russia was emboldened to attempt to extend her influence still further, and this attempt precipitated a reopening of the Eastern Question, and the first great European war since the fall of Napoleon I.

The Principalities.

Ambitions of Nicholas.

Early in 1853 Nicholas I, of Russia, judging the moment opportune, suggested to the English Government that the Turkish Empire was about to fall, and that it would be well for England and Russia to agree on the disposal of the property. "When we are agreed," he said, "I am quite without anxiety as to the rest of Europe; it is immaterial

what others may think or do." He referred to the Turkish Empire as a sick man, a very sick man. The collapse of the Empire he felt to be imminent. It would be wise for the two powers most interested to arrange the division of the estate at once. He suggested that the European territories might be made into independent states, over which presumably Russia would have control; that England might have Egypt and the island of Crete, thus safeguarding her route to India; he himself disclaimed any idea of adding Constantinople to his dominions. The English Government declined to enter into a consideration of the plan, and nothing came of this suggestion of the division of Turkey.

The Holy Places.

For some time a quarrel had been going on between France, Russia, and Turkey, concerning the control of the "holy places" in Palestine, places connected with the birth and life of Christ, and therefore of interest to Christians, particularly Roman Catholic and Greek, who were in the habit of making pilgrimages thither. This matter was finally arranged by negotiation, but the very day after the settlement of this dispute Russia peremptorily put forth a new demand upon the Sultan, namely the right of protection over all Greek Christians living in the Turkish Empire, of whom there were several millions. The demand was loosely expressed and might possibly, if granted, grow into a constant right of intervention by Russia in the internal affairs of Turkey, that country consequently being reduced to a kind of vassalage to the former. This, at any rate, was the assertion of Turkey. The Sultan submitted this demand to the French and English Governments, which advised him to decline it. At once Russia sent troops into the Danubian Principalities, Moldavia and Wallachia, Turkish provinces, in order to enforce the compliance of the Sultan (June 1853). The Sultan demanded that the Russians withdraw from the Principalities. The demand was rejected, and war therefore existed between the two powers, Russia and Turkey. Nicholas expected that the war would be limited to these

War between Russia and Turkey.

two. In this he was shortly undeceived, for England and France, and later Piedmont, came to the support of the Turks, and the first general European war since Napoleon's fall began. Russia found herself at war ultimately with four powers instead of with one.

Coalition against Russia.

The motives that brought about this coalition against Russia are important. Englishmen looked upon Russia as a strong power trying to maltreat a weak one. They remembered that Russia had been the bulwark of conservatism in 1848 and 1849, that she had intervened to put down the Hungarians, no subjects of hers, who had almost won their independence. Many Englishmen were tired of the long peace and ready for a war. War feeling was strong among both Conservatives and Liberals. Lord Palmerston, a prominent member of the Cabinet, desired it. A long-standing dread of Russian expansion into regions too near the route to India also influenced the opinion of Englishmen. The French Emperor, Napoleon III, was inclined to war for several reasons. He had a personal grudge against Nicholas I, who, forced to recognize him as Emperor in 1852, had sulkily addressed him at that time, not in the form usual among rulers, of "My Brother," but in the absurd phrase, in this case really insulting, of "My Dear Friend." Moreover, the treaties of 1815 were in the main still intact and were a striking memorial of the downfall of the Great Emperor. To destroy these treaties, and, if possible, to requite the humiliation of Moscow, would be a sweet revenge, and to throw military glory over his newly and trickily won throne would be a manifest advantage and a real pleasure.

Piedmont joins the coalition.

Piedmont joined the coalition in 1855 for reasons indicated above, hoping to win an influential friend for the nationalistic ambitions of Cavour.

France and England joined Turkey in demanding the withdrawal of Russian troops from the Principalities. The demand was refused by the Tsar. The two powers then concluded a treaty with Turkey, promising military support,

and engaging not to make a separate treaty. On March 27, 1854, they declared war upon Russia.

The Turks meanwhile had been fighting the Russians in the region of the Danube. The French and English now joined them. After a confused campaign the Russians were defeated and forced back over the Danube, and, in June and July 1854, they withdrew entirely from the Principalities. The cause of the war was thus removed. England and France had demanded the evacuation of the Principalities. They were now evacuated. But England and France had ulterior purposes, and consequently the war continued. They desired to humiliate Russia, to weaken her decisively, to prevent her definitely from increasing her power in south-eastern Europe. Thinking to do this most completely, they invaded the Crimea, a peninsula in southern Russia, jutting out into the Black Sea (September 1854). The importance of the Crimea lay in the fact that Russia had constructed there, at Sebastopol, a great naval arsenal, and that the Russian navy was there. To seize Sebastopol, to sink the fleet would destroy Russia's naval power for many years, and thus remove the weapon with which she could seriously menace Turkey.

Invasion of the Crimea.

The siege of Sebastopol.

The siege of Sebastopol was the chief feature of the Crimean war. That siege lasted eleven months. Defended in a masterly fashion by Todleben, the Russian engineer, and the only military hero of the first order that the war developed, Sebastopol finally fell after a murderous bombardment on September 8, 1855. Parts of this campaign, subsidiary to the siege, were the battles of the Alma, of Balaklava, rendered forever memorable by the splendid charges of the heavy and light brigades, and of Inkermann, full of stirring and heroic incident. The Allies suffered fearfully from the weather, the bitter cold, the breakdown of the commissary department, and the shocking inefficiency of the medical and hospital service. These deficiencies were remedied in time, but only after a terrible loss of life. The

Russians suffered from the absence of roads and from the corruption of officials, as well as from the weather. It took a month for soldiers to come the hundred and twenty miles from the northern point of the Crimean peninsula to Sebastopol. Tens of thousands of soldiers perished on the march from the various Russian cities southward.

Early in 1855 (March 2), Nicholas I died, bitterly disappointed at the failure of his plans. Throughout the summer of 1855 the state of Sebastopol grew steadily worse. The number of the killed was appalling, over a thousand a day. It was said by one of the victims of this siege "that statesmen who make wars lightly should be taken to see the hospital for incurable cases at Sebastopol." During the last twenty-eight days of the siege over a million and a half of projectiles were thrown into the place. The French excavations were over fifty miles in length. The long agony drew to a close, and on September 8, 1855, Sebastopol fell after a siege of 336 days, a siege which cost Russia probably 250,000 lives, and an expenditure far out of proportion to her resources.

Fall of Sebastopol.

The war dragged on for some weeks longer, but as most of the powers were anxious for peace, they agreed to enter the Congress of Paris, which met February 25, 1856, and which, after a month's deliberation, signed the Treaty of Paris, March 30, 1856. The treaty provided that the Black Sea should henceforth be neutralized, that it should not be open to vessels of war, even of those countries bordering on it, Russia and Turkey, and that no arsenals should be established or maintained on its shores. Its waters were to be open to the merchant ships of every nation. The navigation of the Danube was declared free. The Russian protectorate over Moldavia and Wallachia was abolished, and they were declared independent under the suzerainty of the Porte. Russia was pushed back from all contact with the Danube by the cession of a small part of Bessarabia to Moldavia. The most important clause was that by which

Treaty of Paris.

Turkey admitted to the European Concert.

the powers admitted Turkey to the European Concert, from which she had been previously excluded, by which they also recognized and guaranteed the independence and territorial integrity of that country, and renounced all claim on their part, separately or collectively, to intervene in her internal affairs. This action was taken, it was said, because the Sultan had, "in his constant solicitude for the welfare of his subjects, issued a firman recording his generous intentions towards the Christian population of his Empire." This treaty was signed by the representatives of Turkey, England, France, Austria, Russia, Prussia, and Piedmont.

Results of the Crimean War.

Thus closed a war which cost several hundred thousand lives. There was an uneasy feeling in governing circles after the war that little had been accomplished by this large and horrible expenditure, and that that little was not likely to endure. Future events justified this premonition. Just fourteen years later, during the Franco-German war, when Europe was powerless to prevent, Russia announced that she would no longer observe the provision concerning the neutrality of the Black Sea, and in 1878 she recovered the strip of Bessarabia that gave her access to the lower courses of the Danube. The promise of the Sultan that the lot of his Christian subjects should be improved was ignored. Their condition became worse. And the guaranty of the integrity of his empire, and the promise of the powers not to interfere in his domestic administration were to ring hollow twenty years later. The Sultan gained in importance from this war; the French Emperor gained military glory and diplomatic prestige; the King of Piedmont was shortly to be amply repaid for his efforts by the aid of Napoleon III in his Italian policy. The Crimean war had this further result that, showing the inefficiency of the Russian government, it was a main cause of the wave of reform which swept over that country in the early years of the reign of Alexander II. As a solution of the Eastern Question the war was a flat failure.

FROM THE TREATY OF PARIS TO THE TREATY OF BERLIN

The Eastern Question is primarily that of the fate of European Turkey. Shall that country be preserved intact or shall it be dismembered; if the latter, what shall be the status of the part or parts taken from the Sultan? By the middle of the nineteenth century the solution of the question had not progressed far. The only part that had become independent was Greece, the founding of which kingdom has been traced. The Greeks, however, were not satisfied with their boundaries and cherished the fervent ambition that they might annex other parts of Turkey in which members of their race were living, and even entertained the hope of Constantinople, the possession of which priceless position forms the very crux of the whole Eastern Question. Two other sections of European Turkey had almost attained statehood, though they were still nominally provinces of Turkey: Servia and Moldavia-Wallachia. Both aspired to convert a semi-independence into complete independence. In Moldavia-Wallachia a national spirit had been slowly growing up. The inhabitants, feeling that they were of the same stock, and ought to be thoroughly united, were growing accustomed to apply to themselves the single term, Roumanians. They were proud of their ancient origin, of their language, largely of Latin origin, and of their history. They felt that they were destined to be masters in their own house, not pawns to be used by Turkey or Russia. The impulse toward nationality, so striking and fruitful a characteristic of the century, moved them, as it was moving Italians and Germans. The Crimean war facilitated the realization of their ambitions. Though the Roumanians took no part in the war, they profited by it. By the Treaty of Paris all Russian rights of protection over the provinces were abolished, and though the Sultan still remained their sovereign he promised to grant an "independent and national

Moldavia-Wallachia.

The Roumanians and the Crimean War.

administration." England and France wished to go a step further, and to recognize the two provinces as an entirely independent state of Roumania. There would be a manifest advantage in that such a state would constitute a buffer between Russia and Turkey, standing right athwart the way to Constantinople, which they believed Russia coveted. But Austria and Turkey blocked this suggestion for the time being. The powers decided, in 1858, in a conference held in Paris that, despite the wishes of the people for union, they should remain separate. There should be two princes or hospodars elected by representatives of the people, but invested with their powers by the Sultan. There should also be an assembly in each, but a kind of central committee should prepare legislation common to the "United Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia," as they were officially called. This, of course, did not satisfy the inhabitants of the two Principalities, who felt that they were one in race and language and tradition, and ought to be one in fact. The Moldavians and Wallachians now proceeded to solve the matters to their taste, encouraged in this by Napoleon III, true to his favorite theory of nationalities. Each elected, early in 1859, the same man, Colonel Alexander Couza, as its prince. This double election accomplished the desired result. Thus the Principalities were united *de facto*. Austria was in no position to forbid this consummation as she was then involved in war in Italy. Later the two assemblies were merged into one, and in 1862 the Sultan recognized these changes. Thus the Moldavians and Wallachians had achieved their union, had assumed the name Roumania, and had chosen Bucharest as their capital. But it remained for them to attain complete independence. They still paid tribute to the Sultan, from whom their prince received his investiture. The new ruler, "Prince of Roumania," a native of Moldavia, styled himself Alexander John I, but he was always known by his family name of Couza. He ruled seven years. They were years of great

The union of the Principalities.

Couza.

turbulence. The Prince was in constant conflict with the assembly, and ruled most of the time in defiance of the constitution. He alienated the influential classes of the clergy and nobility or great landowners, the former by confiscating the property of the monasteries, an act later vetoed by the powers unless the clergy should be indemnified, and the latter by freeing the peasants from their feudal dues, and transferring most of the land to them on the condition that they pay for it in fifteen annual instalments. This was a beneficial social reform, somewhat resembling the liberation of the serfs in Russia. It created a class of about 400,000 small proprietors. But, of course, it made the nobles his enemies. The masses, on the other hand, thus benefited, were offended by the tobacco monopoly which Couza introduced. A conspiracy was formed which, in 1866, succeeded in forcing him to abdicate. Convinced by this experience that it was unwise to raise one of their own citizens to the position of ruler, the Roumanians decided to call in a foreign prince. They chose a member of the Roman Catholic branch of the Hohenzollern family who became Charles I of Roumania. This German prince, who is still their ruler, was then twenty-seven years of age. He at once set to work to study the conditions of his newly adopted country, ably seconded in this by his wife, a German princess, whose literary gift was to win her a great reputation, and was to be used in the interest of Roumania. As "Carmen Sylva" she has written poems and stories, has published a collection of Roumanian folklore, and has encouraged the national idea by showing her preference for the native Roumanian dress and for old Roumanian customs.

Charles I of Roumania.

Charles I was primarily a soldier, and the great work of the early years of his reign was to build up the army, as he believed it essential if Roumania was to be really independent in her attitude toward Russia and Turkey. He increased the size of the army, equipped it with Prussian guns, and had it drilled by Prussian officers. The wisdom of this

was apparent when the Eastern Question was reopened in 1875. The fact that she possessed an army of the modern type enabled Roumania to play an important part in the affairs of the Balkan peninsula.

Reopening of the Eastern Question.

In 1875 the Eastern Question entered once more upon an acute phase. Movements began which were to have a profound effect upon the various sections of the peninsula. An insurrection broke out in the summer of 1875 in Herzegovina, a province west of Servia. For years the peasantry had suffered under the gross misrule of the Turks. Turkey, almost bankrupt, resorted to heavier taxation, especially of her Christian subjects. The oppression became so grinding and was accompanied by acts so barbarous and inhuman that the peasants finally rebelled. These peasants were Slavs, and as such were aided by Slavs from neighboring regions, Bosnia, Servia, and Bulgaria. They were made all the more bitter because they saw Slavs in Servia comparatively contented, as they were largely self-governed. Why should not they themselves enjoy as good conditions as others? Religious and racial hatred of Christian and Slav against the infidel Turk flamed up throughout the peninsula. The Balkan peoples also were stirred, as were so many others, by the sight of Italy achieving her independence on the basis of nationality. The Turks did not succeed in stamping out this dangerous movement at its commencement, encouraged as it was by the Slavs of Servia, Montenegro, and even Austria. Attempts were made by diplomacy to induce the Porte to make concessions sufficient to pacify the discontented Christians. The attempts failed, as the Christians placed no faith in Turkish promises and as the powers were not united in their demands, England rejecting the arrangement that seemed most likely to ensure peace by guaranteeing on the part of the powers the effective execution of the Sultan's promise of reform. (Berlin Memorandum, 1876.)

The insurrection of Herzegovina.

Meanwhile events occurred in Constantinople which greatly

complicated the situation. In March 1876, the Sultan, Abdul-Aziz, was deposed by a palace revolution, and his nephew put upon the throne as Murad V. The new Sultan was shortly found to be, or at least was declared to be, imbecile, and was deposed after a reign of three months. Thereupon his brother, Abdul Hamid II, ascended the throne, a very resolute, subtle, and resourceful man. These rapid changes in Constantinople were due to a recrudescence of national and religious fanaticism in Turkey, to a feeling that Turkey should be for the Turks, that she should no longer be the sport of foreign powers, that she should control her own destinies without intervention. But the intervention of the Christian powers was becoming more and more inevitable because of this very revival of racial and religious fanaticism. They could not rest easy witnessing the outrages committed upon their co-religionists. And just at this time those outrages attained a ferocity that shocked all Europe.

Accession of Abdul Hamid II.

Early in 1876 the Christians in Bulgaria, a large province of European Turkey, rose against the Turkish officials, killing some of them. The revenge taken by the Turks was of incredible atrocity. Pouring regular troops and the ferocious irregulars called Bashi-Bazouks into the province, they butchered thousands with every refinement or coarseness of brutality. In the valley of the Maritza all but fifteen of eighty villages were practically destroyed. An official report to the English government of what occurred at Batak, a town of about 7,000 inhabitants, indicates graphically the style adopted and pursued. A Turk named Achmet Agha was ordered to attack it. "The inhabitants had a parley with Achmet who solemnly swore that if they gave up their arms not a hair of their heads should be touched. The villagers believed Achmet's oath and surrendered their arms, but this demand was followed by another for all the money in the village, which, of course, had also to be acceded to. No sooner was the money given up than the Bashi-Bazouks set upon the people and slaughtered

The Bulgarian atrocities.

them like sheep. A large number of people, probably about one thousand or twelve hundred, took refuge in the church and churchyard, the latter being surrounded by a wall. The church itself is a solid building and resisted all the attempts of the Bashi-Bazouks to burn it from the outside. They consequently fired in through the windows, and getting upon the roof tore off the tiles, and threw burning pieces of wood and rags dipped in petroleum among the mass of unhappy human beings inside. At last the door was forced in, the massacre completed, and the inside of the church burned. The spectacle which the church and churchyard present must be seen to be described; hardly a corpse has been buried. . . . I visited this valley of the shadow of death on the 31st of July, more than two months and a half after the massacre, but still the stench was so overpowering that one could hardly force one's way into the church. In the streets at every step lay remains rotting and sweltering in the summer sun. Just outside the village I counted more than sixty skulls in a little hollow. From the remains of female wearing apparel scattered about it is plain that many of the persons here massacred were women." [1] This official estimated that in Batak alone the number of killed was about 5,000.

Gladstone's denunciation of the Turks.

The Bulgarian atrocities thrilled all Europe with horror. Mr. Gladstone, emerging from retirement, denounced "the unspeakable Turk" in a flaming pamphlet called "Bulgarian Horrors and the Question of the East." He demanded that England cease to support a government that was an affront to the laws of God, and urged that the Turks be expelled from Europe "bag and baggage." The Disraeli ministry dared not lend its support in behalf of Turkey, as it would have liked to do, so vehement was public opinion. It did not, however, intervene in behalf of the oppressed Christians.

Servia and Montenegro, in July 1876, declared war

[1] Baring's report.

against Turkey, and the insurrection of the Bulgarians became general. The Russian people became intensely excited in their sympathy with their co-religionists and their fellow-Slavs. Thousands of Russian volunteers enrolled under the Servian flag. But the Turks were able to overcome their enemies by force of superior numbers. Alexander II did not wish war, but on November 2, 1876, he said to the British ambassador that the present state of affairs in Turkey "was intolerable, and unless Europe was prepared to act with firmness and energy, he should be obliged to act alone." He would act, not for self-interest, but solely in the name of humanity. He had not "the smallest wish or intention to be possessed of Constantinople." Renewed attempts were made to settle the whole trouble by diplomacy. These attempts proved unsuccessful owing to the opposition of the Sultan, who was dominated by reactionary forces, and who felt certain that support would come from the west, particularly from England. He remembered the Crimean war.

Servia and Montenegro declare war.

Russia, tired of long drawn out and insincere negotiations, declared war upon Turkey, April 24, 1877. She had as allies Roumania, which took occasion to proclaim its entire independence of Turkey (May 21, 1877), Servia, and Montenegro. The war lasted until the close of January 1878. Crossing the Danube and pushing southward, the Russians gained some successes, and seized one of the passes through the Balkans. But the key to the campaign was the control of Plevna. This place, situated between the Danube and the Balkans, was the center of an extensive system of roads through Bulgaria. The Russians could not safely pass south of the Balkans without controlling this strategic position. They had made the mistake of allowing the Turkish commander, Osman Pasha, to occupy and to fortify it. The Russians made three vigorous attempts to carry it by storm, but were repulsed with heavy losses (July-September 1877). It was evident that Plevna could not be taken by assault but only by regular siege. Todleben,

Russia declares war.

The siege of Plevna.

who had distinguished himself greatly as the defender of Sebastopol in the Crimean war, was now placed in supreme command. By October 24th the investment was completed by an army numbering fully 120,000 men. The siege was slow but was finally successful. On December 10th, Osman surrendered an army of 43,000 soldiers and seventy-seven guns. His defense had been very brilliant. He had detained for five months an army three times as large as his own.

The backbone of Turkish resistance was thus broken. Though it was mid-winter the Russians now poured through the passes of the Balkans, and marched rapidly toward Constantinople. On January 20, 1878, they entered Adrianople. The Sultan sought peace, and on March 3rd the Treaty of San Stefano was concluded between Russia and Turkey. By this treaty the Porte recognized the complete independence of Servia, Montenegro, and Roumania, and made certain cessions of territory to the two former states. The main feature of the treaty concerned Bulgaria, which was made a self-governing state, tributary to the Sultan. Its frontiers were very liberally drawn. Its territory was to include nearly all of European Turkey, between Roumania and Servia to the north, and Greece to the south. Only a broken strip across the peninsula, from Constantinople west to the Adriatic, was to be left to Turkey. The new state therefore was to include not only Bulgaria proper, but Roumelia to the south and most of Macedonia. Mr. Gladstone's desire for the expulsion of the Turks from Europe "bag and baggage" was nearly realized.

Treaty of San Stefano.

Opposition to the treaty.

But this treaty was not destined to be carried out. It satisfied no one except the Russians and the Bulgarians. There was much opposition to it in the Balkan peninsula itself. The Greeks opposed it because it cut short the expansion they desired northward, particularly into Macedonia. The Servians were opposed for a similar reason, as they wished a part of this territory now adjudged to Bulgaria. Many Servians lived in Macedonia. The Rou-

anians protested vehemently when they learned that, in ward for their services to Russia at Plevna, they were to de to Russia a part of their territory, Bessarabia, receiving an inferior compensation in the Dobrudscha, a region about the mouths of the Danube. But more important was the opposition of the powers of western Europe. They did not wish to have the Eastern Question solved without their consent. England particularly, fearing Russian expansion southward toward the Mediterranean, and believing that Bulgaria and the other states would be merely tools of sia, declared that the arrangements concerning the peninmust be determined by the great European powers, that Treaty of San Stefano must be submitted to a general ress on the ground that, according to the international of Europe, the Eastern Question could not be settled by nation but only by the concert of powers, as it affected n all. Aus joined the protest, wishing a part of spoils of Tu for herself. Russia naturally objected llowing tho had not fought determine the outcome ier victory. But as the powers were insistent, particularly England, then under the Beaconsfield administration, nd as she was in no position for further hostilities, she ielded. The Congress of Berlin was held under the presilency of Bismarck, Beaconsfield himself representing Engnd. It drew up the Treaty of Berlin, which was signed ly 13, 1878. By this treaty Montenegro, Servia, and umania were rendered completely independent of Turkey. e Greater Bulgaria of the Treaty of San Stefano was ided into three main parts, Macedonia, left as a part Turkey under the direct authority of the Sultan, Eastern Roumelia, as a part of Turkey, but to be autonomous and to have a Christian governor appointed by the Sultan, and Bulgaria, to be still nominally a part of Turkey, but to be autonomous, with a prince to be elected freely by the Bulgarians, the election, however, to be confirmed by the Sultan vith the assent of the powers. The various powers were not

England demands its revision.

The Congress of Berlin.

thinking of Turkey in all this, nor of the happiness o the people who had long been oppressed by Turkey. The found the occasion convenient for taking various Turkis possessions for themselves. Austria was invited to "occupy and administer Bosnia and Herzegovina in the interest o the peace of Europe. Russia retained a part of Turkis Armenia, which she had conquered, and which include Ardahan, Kars, and Batoum. The Congress also force Roumania to cede Bessarabia to Russia and to take th Dobrudscha as compensation. This made Roumania th enemy of Russia as the district ceded was peopled by Rou manians, not by Russians. The powers recommended tha the Sultan cede Thessaly and a part of Epirus to Greece, recommendation only grudgingly complied with three year later. Before the meeting of the Congress, England ha induced Turkey to permit her to occupy the islan of Cyprus, and in return for this she undertook t guarantee the integrity of the Sultan's remaining dominion in Asia.

Independence of Montenegro, Servia, and Roumania.

As a result of this war, therefore, three Balkan state long in the process of formation, Montenegro, Servia, ar Roumania, had become entirely independent of their form suzerain Turkey, and a new state, Bulgaria, had been call into existence, though still slightly subject to the Porte, a a new district, Eastern Roumelia, was assured a freer li though denied union with Bulgaria. All this had been accom plished as a result of the intervention of Russia.

The Treaty of Berlin was not a final solution of th Eastern Question. In one of its most important provision it did not endure ten years. The device of separating th Bulgarians north of the Balkans from the Bulgarians soutl of the Balkans, in spite of the entire racial and spiritua unity of the two, and the wishes of the two, of attemptin also to make the latter forget that they were Bulgarian by the childish device of calling their province Eastern Rou melia, endured precisely seven years. In 1885 the Bul

Union of the two Bulgarias.

garians took matters into their own hands, declared themselves united, and tore up this arrangement of the Congress of Berlin, and the powers were forced to look on in acquiescence. The other arrangement of leaving Macedonia in the hands of Turkey simply raised another question, the Macedonian, which has since that day been a source of constant uneasiness to Europe, a recurrent cause of alarm, frequently threatening a general conflagration. As far as humanitarian considerations are concerned this disposition of Macedonia has been a colossal blunder. The Turks have not carried out the promised reforms, and the conditions of the people would certainly have been greatly improved had Macedonia been a part of Bulgaria as provided by the Treaty of San Stefano. This determination of the fate of Macedonia, which was the essential difference between the two treaties, was one wholly deplorable. Owing to the rival ambitions of the western powers Macedonian Christians were destined long to suffer an odious oppression from which more fortunate Balkan Christians were free.

Macedonia.

On the other hand, the benefits assured by the Treaty of Berlin were great and unmistakable. Before the Russo-Turkish war the population of European Turkey was about seventeen or eighteen million. As a result of the Treaty of Berlin, European Turkey was greatly reduced, and its population was only about six million. In other words eleven million people or more had been emancipated from Turkish control. This constituted an important partition of Turkey. Yet the powers had, in 1856, guaranteed the territorial integrity and the independence in internal affairs of the Ottoman Empire, a guarantee as farcical as many others made in the course of the history of this Eastern Question.

BULGARIA SINCE 1878

The Treaty of Berlin, while it brought substantial advantages, did not bring peace to the Balkan peninsula. The history of the various states since 1878, both in internal

affairs and in their foreign relations, has been agitated, yet, despite disturbances, considerable progress has been made.

Bulgaria, of which Europe knew hardly anything in 1876, was, in 1878, made an autonomous state, but it did not attain complete independence, as it was nominally a part of the Turkish Empire, to which it was to pay tribute. The new principality owed its existence to Russia, and for several years Russian influence predominated in it. It was started on its career by Russian officials. A constitution was drawn up establishing an assembly called the Sobranje. This assembly chose as Prince of Bulgaria, Alexander of Battenberg, a young German of twenty-two, a relative of the Russian Imperial House, supposedly acceptable to the Tsar (April 1879).

Alexander of Battenberg.

The Bulgarians were grateful to the Russians for their aid. They recognized those who remained after the war was over as having all the rights of Bulgarian citizens, among others the right to hold office. Russians held important positions in the Bulgarian ministry. Russians organized the military forces and became officers. Before long, however, friction developed, and gratitude gave way to indignation at the high-handed conduct of the Russians, who plainly regarded Bulgaria as a sort of province or outpost of Russia, to be administered according to Russian ideas and interests. The Russian ministers were arrogant, and made it evident that they regarded the Tsar, not Prince Alexander, as their superior, whose wishes they were bound to execute. The Prince, the native army officers, and the people found their position increasingly humiliating. Finally, in 1883, the Russian ministers were virtually forced to resign, and the Prince now relied upon Bulgarian leaders. This caused an open breach with Russia which was further widened by the discovery of an unsuccessful Russian plot to kidnap Alexander.

Friction between the Bulgarians and the Russians.

Meanwhile, the resentment of the Bulgarians of Eastern

Roumelia at their separation from Bulgaria by the Treaty of Berlin steadily increased, and in 1885 a bloodless revolution was carried through which destroyed this artificial arrangement. The people of that province expelled the representative of Turkish authority, and expressed their enthusiastic desire for union with Bulgaria. Prince Alexander was forced to choose between the Russians, whom he knew to be opposed to this aggrandizement of Bulgaria, and his own people and those of Eastern Roumelia, who were eager for the union. He chose the latter and became the "Prince of the Two Bulgarias." It was expected that international complications would result, that Europe would insist upon the observance of the Treaty of Berlin. But the moment for collective intervention was not propitious, owing mainly to the extraordinarily tangled internal political conditions in various countries. The wrath of Russia was great, and was shown in her recall of all Russian officers from the Bulgarian army, leaving the army demoralized in its leadership. Just at this moment, Servia, claiming that the union of Eastern Roumelia and Bulgaria would overthrow the equilibrium of the Balkan states, jealous of the aggrandizement of her neighbor, and believing that her army was disorganized, and that the European nations would chastise her for her action in regard to Eastern Roumelia, suddenly attacked her. Bulgaria took up the gauntlet, enthusiasm fired her army, and, crippled as she was, to the astonishment of Europe she expelled the Servians, severely defeated them, and invaded their own country only to be stopped by Austria, which insisted upon a treaty between the combatants on the basis of the situation before the war (Treaty of Bucharest, March 3, 1886). Bulgaria gained no territory by this war, but she gained prestige. She stood before Europe in a new light, and the war really founded her unity. In the face of the unanimous desire of the people, it was seen to be futile to insist on the separateness of Roumelia, now swallowed up in Bulgaria.

Breach of the Treaty of Berlin.

Servia attacks Bulgaria, Nov. 1885.

The powers protested against this unification, and would not recognize the change, but they refrained from doing anything further.

Russia, however, incensed at the growing independence of the new state, which she looked upon as a mere satellite, resolved to read her a lesson in humility by organizing a conspiracy. The conspirators seized Prince Alexander in his bedroom in the dead of night, forced him to sign his abdication, and then carried him off to Russian soil. Alexander was detained in Russia a short time, until it was supposed that the Russian party was thoroughly established in power in Bulgaria, when he was permitted to go to Austria. He was immediately recalled to Bulgaria, returned to receive an immense ovation, and then, at the height of his popularity, in a moment of weakness, abdicated, apparently overwhelmed by the continued opposition of Russia (September 7, 1886). The situation was most critical. Two parties advocating opposite policies confronted each other; one pro-Russian, believing that Bulgaria should accept in place of Alexander any prince whom the Tsar should choose for her; the other national and independent, rallying to the cry of "Bulgaria for the Bulgarians." The latter speedily secured control, fortunate in that it had a remarkable leader in the person of Stambuloff, a native, a son of an innkeeper, a man of extraordinary firmness, suppleness, and courage, vigorous and intelligent. Through him Russian efforts to regain control of the principality were foiled and a new ruler was secured, Prince Ferdinand of Saxe-Coburg, twenty-six years of age, who was elected unanimously by the Sobranje, July 7, 1887. Russia protested against this action, and none of the great powers recognized Ferdinand.

Abdication of Prince Alexander.

Ferdinand of Saxe-Coburg.

Dictatorship of Stambuloff.

Stambuloff was the most forceful statesman developed in the history of the Balkan states. He succeeded in keeping Bulgaria self-dependent. During the earlier years of his rule Ferdinand relied upon him, and, indeed, owed to him his

continuance on the throne. He won the pretentious title of "the Bulgarian Bismarck." His methods resembled those of his Teutonic prototype in more than one respect. For seven years he was practically dictator of Bulgaria. Russian plots continued. He repressed them pitilessly. His one fundamental principle was Bulgaria for the Bulgarians. His rule was one of terror, of suppression of liberties, of unscrupulousness, directed to patriotic ends. His object was to rid Bulgaria of Russian, as of Turkish control. Bulgaria under him increased in wealth and population. The army received a modern equipment, universal military service was instituted, commerce was encouraged, railroads were built, popular education begun, and the capital, Sofia, a dirty, wretched Turkish village, made over into one of the attractive capitals of Europe. But Stambuloff made a multitude of enemies, and as a result he fell from power in 1894. In the following year he was foully murdered in the streets of Sofia. But he had done his work thoroughly, and it remains the basis of the life of Bulgaria to-day. The Turkish sovereignty was merely nominal, and even that was not destined to endure long. In March 1896 the election of Ferdinand as prince was finally recognized by the great powers. The preceding years had been immensely significant. They had thoroughly consolidated the unity of Bulgaria, had permitted her institutions to strike root, had accustomed her to independence of action, to self-reliance. Those years, too, had been used for the enrichment of the national life with the agencies of the modern world, schools, railways, an army. Bulgaria had a population of about four million, a capital in Sofia, an area of about 38,000 square miles. She aspired to annex Macedonia, where, however, she was to encounter many rivals. She only awaited a favorable opportunity to renounce her nominal connection with Turkey. The opportunity came in 1908. On October 5th of that year Bulgaria declared her independence, and her Prince assumed the title of King.

Murder of Stambuloff.

ROUMANIA AND SERVIA SINCE 1878

At the outbreak of the Russo-Turkish war in 1877, Roumania declared herself entirely independent of Turkey. This independence was recognized by the Sultan and the powers at the Congress of Berlin on condition that all citizens should enjoy legal equality, whatever their religion, a condition designed to protect the Jews, who were numerous, but who had previously been without political rights.

Roumania proclaimed a kingdom.

In 1881 Roumania proclaimed herself a kingdom, and her prince henceforth styled himself King Charles I. The royal crown was made of steel from a Turkish gun captured at Plevna, a perpetual reminder of what was her war of independence. Roumania has created an army on Prussian models of about 175,000 men, has built railroads and highways, and has, by agrarian legislation, improved the condition of the peasantry. The population has steadily increased, and now numbers nearly seven million. The area of Roumania is about 50,000 square miles. While mainly an agricultural country, in recent years her industrial development has been notable, and her commerce is more important than that of any other Balkan state. Her government is a constitutional monarchy, with legislative chambers. The most important political question in recent years has been a demand for the reform of the electoral system, which resembles the Prussian three-class system, and which gives the direct vote to only a small fraction of the population.

Agrarian disturbances.

In 1907 the peasantry rose in insurrection, demanding agrarian reforms. As more than four-fifths of the population live upon the land, and as the population has steadily increased, the holding of each peasant has correspondingly decreased. A military force of 140,000 men was needed to quell the revolt. After having restored order, the ministry introduced and carried various measures intended to bring relief to the peasants from their severest burdens.

Servia, also, was recognized as independent by the Berlin Treaty in 1878. She proclaimed herself a kingdom in 1882. She has had a turbulent history in recent years. In 1885 she declared war against Bulgaria, as has been stated, only to be unexpectedly and badly defeated. The financial policy was deplorable. In seven years the debt increased from seven million to three hundred and twelve million francs. The scandals of the private life of King Milan utterly discredited the monarchy. He was forced to abdicate in 1889, and was succeeded by his twelve-year-old son, Alexander I, who was brutally murdered in 1903 with his wife, Queen Draga, in a midnight palace revolution, and the present occupant of the throne, Peter I, has been in most unstable power since then. The present King is of the house of Karageorge, which has ended its century-long feud with the house of Obrenovitch by exterminating the latter in the murders of 1903. While some progress has been made along economic and educational lines, the condition of the country is far from satisfactory. The present régime is odious by reason of the manner of its origin. Its duration is problematical. **Servia.**

GREECE SINCE 1833

In January 1833, Otto, second son of Louis I, the King of Bavaria, became King of Greece, a country of great poverty, with a population of about 750,000, unaccustomed to the reign of law and order usual in western Europe. The kingdom was small, with unsatisfactory boundaries, lacking Thessaly, which was peopled entirely by Greeks. The country had been devastated by a long and unusually sanguinary war. Internal conditions were anarchic. Brigandage was rife; the debt was large. The problem was, how to make out of such unpromising materials a prosperous and progressive state.

King Otto reigned from 1833 to 1862. He was aided in his government by many Bavarians, who filled important **Reign of Otto I.**

positions in the army and the civil service. This German influence was a primary cause of the unpopularity of the new régime. The beginnings were made, however, in the construction of a healthy national life. Athens was made the capital, and a university was established there. A police system was organized; a national bank created. In 1844 Otto was forced to consent to the conversion of his absolute monarchy into a constitutional one. A parliament with two chambers, the Deputies being chosen by universal suffrage, was instituted. The political education of the Greeks then began.

From the reopening of the Eastern Question by the Crimean war Greece hoped to profit by the enlargement of her boundaries. The great powers, however, thought otherwise, and forced her to remain quiet. Because the Government did not defy Europe and insist upon her rights, which would have been an insane proceeding, it became very unpopular. For this reason, as well as for despotic tendencies, Otto was driven from power in 1862 by an insurrection, and left Greece, never to return.

Overthrow of Otto.

A new king was secured in the person of a Danish prince, who became George I, in 1863, and who still rules, a brother of the present King of Denmark (1909). That his popularity might be strengthened at the very outset, England in 1864 ceded to the kingdom the Ionian Islands, which she had held since 1815. This was the first enlargement of the kingdom since its foundation. A new constitution was established (1864) which abolished the Senate and left all parliamentary power in the hands of a single assembly, the Boulé, elected by universal suffrage, and consisting of 192 members, with a four-year term. Political parties have been little more than personal or local coteries, struggling for office as a means of livelihood. In 1881, mainly through the exertions of England, the Sultan was induced to cede Thessaly to Greece, and thus a second enlargement of territory occurred. This was in accordance with the promise

The Ionian Islands.

Annexation of Thessaly.

of the Congress of Berlin that the Greek frontier should be "rectified."

In 1897 Greece declared war against Turkey, aiming at the annexation of Crete, which had risen in insurrection against Turkey. Greece was easily defeated, and was forced to cede certain parts of Thessaly to Turkey and give up the project of the annexation of Crete. After long negotiations among the powers, the latter island was made autonomous under the suzerainty of the Sultan, and under the direct administration of Prince George, a son of the King of Greece,[1] who remained in power until 1906.

Greece is not in sound financial condition. Her debt is very large, having grown owing to armaments, the building of railroads, and the digging of canals. The country has advanced in population and now numbers about two and a half millions. Her wealth has increased, and much has been accomplished in the direction of popular education. Her parliamentary history has been troubled by incessant factional disputes. Since the accession of the present King in 1863 there have been about fifty ministries. It is estimated that the Greeks now number about eight millions. The large majority, therefore, live outside the Greek kingdom.

Aspirations of the Balkan States.

None of these Balkan states is satisfied with its present boundaries. Roumania wishes to include in the kingdom the Roumanians of Russian Bessarabia, and of eastern Hungary. Servians dream of a Greater Servia, to include those of their race in Bosnia and Herzegovina and southern Hungary, a dream that recent events seem to have forever dissipated. Bulgarians desire the annexation of parts of

[1] A constitution was promulgated for Crete in 1899 which has since been superseded by the constitution of 1907, which provides for an assembly of sixty-five members, elected for three years. The High Commissioner, or chief executive, is appointed by the King of Greece with the assent of the four protecting powers, Great Britain, France, Russia, and Italy. Questions concerning the foreign relations of Crete are determined by the representatives of these powers.

Macedonia, or all of it. The Greeks desire Macedonia and Crete. They dream of a Greater Greece, dominating the Ægean.

Servian, Bulgarian, and Greek rivalries meet in the plains of Macedonia, which each country covets, and which is inhabited by representatives of all these peoples hopelessly intermixed. The problem of Macedonia is further complicated by the rivalry of the great powers, and by the transformation which Turkey is herself undergoing.

REVOLUTION IN TURKEY

The Eastern Question entered upon a new and startling phase in the summer of 1908. In July a swift, sweeping, and pacific revolution occurred in Turkey. The Young Turks, a liberal, revolutionary, constitutional party, dominated by the political principles of western Europe, seized control of the government, to the complete surprise of the diplomatists and public of Europe. This party consisted of those who had been driven from Turkey by the despotism of the Sultan, Abdul Hamid II, and were resident abroad, chiefly in Paris, and of those who, still living in Turkey, dissembled their opinions and were able to escape expulsion. Its members desired the overthrow of the despotic, corrupt, and inefficient government, and the creation in its place of a modern liberal system, capable, by varied and thoroughgoing reforms, of ranging Turkey among progressive nations. Weaving their conspiracy in silence and with remarkable adroitness, they succeeded in drawing into it the Turkish army, hitherto the solid bulwark of the Sultan's power. Then, at the ripe moment, the army refused to obey the Sultan's orders, and the conspirators demanded peremptorily by telegraph that the Sultan restore the Constitution of 1876, a constitution granted by the Sultan in that year merely to enable him to weather a crisis, and which, having quickly served the purpose, had been immediately suspended and had remained suspended ever since. The Sultan, seeing

The Young Turks.

Revolution of July 1908.

the ominous defection of the army, complied at once with the demands of the Young Turks, "restored" on July 24th the Constitution of 1876, and ordered elections for a parliament, which should meet in November. Thus an odious tyranny was instantly swept away. It was a veritable coup d'état, this time effected, not by some would-be autocrat, but by the army, usually the chief support of despotism or of the authority of the monarch, now, however, the chief instrument for the achievement of freedom for the democracy. This military revolution, completely successful and almost bloodless, was received with incredible enthusiasm throughout the entire breadth of the Sultan's dominions. Insurgents and soldiers, Mohammedans and Christians, Greeks, Serbs, Bulgarians, Albanians, Armenians, Turks, all joined in jubilant celebrations of the release from intolerable conditions. The most astonishing feature was the complete subsidence of the racial and religious hatreds which had hitherto torn and ravaged the Empire from end to end. The revolution proved to be the most fraternal movement in modern history. Picturesque and memorable were the scenes of universal reconciliation. The ease and suddenness with which this astounding change was effected proved the universality of the detestation of the reign and methods of Abdul Hamid II throughout all his provinces and among all his peoples.

Restoration of the Constitution.

Apparent unanimity of this movement.

It is a significant fact that, since the defeat of Russia by the Japanese in 1904-05, and apparently as a consequence of that defeat, autocracy has been greatly undermined in eastern Europe, its last stronghold. Russia has its Duma, Persia in Asia its constitution, Austria its universal suffrage, Turkey its new régime.

The Young Turks, who thus seized control of the government in July 1908, forcing the Sultan to obey their orders, illustrated excellently two of the dominant passions of the nineteenth century, the spirit of nationality and the spirit of democracy. They wished to modernize and energize their country by comprehensive reforms in civil ad-

A modernized Turkey

ministration, in the judicial system, in the army and navy, in education, and in economic conditions. Thus Turkey, modern and liberal, would be strong enough in the loyalty and well-being of its citizens to assert its position in the world as one of the family of nations. The Young Turks were a patriotic and liberal party, intent upon maintaining the integrity of the Empire, and upon gaining political and civil freedom for the people. Might not the old racial and religious feuds disappear under a new régime, where each locality would have a certain autonomy, large enough to insure essential freedom in religion and in language? Might not a strong national patriotism be developed out of the polyglot conditions by freedom, a thing which despotism had never been able to evoke? Might not Turkey become a stronger nation by adopting the principle of true toleration toward all her various races and religions? Had not the time come for the elimination of these primitive but hardy prejudices and animosities? Might not races and creeds be subordinated to a large and essential unity? Might this not be the final, though unexpected, solution of the famous Eastern Question? Such, at least, was the evident hope of the Young Turks. They desired to realize the social solidarity represented in their cry, "One Flag, One People." But at best the problem of so vast a transformation would be very difficult. The unanimity shown in the joyous destruction of the old system might not be shown in the construction of the new, as many precedents in European history proved. If Turkey were left alone to concentrate her entire energy upon the impending work of reform, she might perhaps succeed. But she was not to be left alone now any more than she had been for centuries.

Attitude of foreign powers.

The Eastern Question has long perplexed the powers of Europe, and has at the same time lured them on to seek their own advantage in its labyrinthine mazes. It is conspicuously an international problem. But the internal reform of Turkey might profoundly alter her international

position by increasing the power of the Empire. Thus it came about that the July Revolution of 1908 instantly riveted the attention of European powers and precipitated a series of startling events. Might not a reformed Turkey, animated with a new national spirit, with her army and finances reorganized and placed upon a solid basis, attempt to recover complete control of some of the possessions which, as we have seen, had been really, though not nominally and technically, torn from her—Bosnia, Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Crete, possibly Cyprus, possibly Egypt? There was very little evidence to show that the Young Turks had any such intention or dreamed of entering upon so hazardous an adventure. Indeed, it was quite apparent that they asked nothing better than to be left alone, fully recognizing the intricacy of their immediate problem, the need of quiet for its solution. But the extremity of one is the opportunity of another.

Austria-Hungary annexes Bosnia and Herzegovina.

On October 3rd Emperor Francis Joseph of Austria-Hungary announced, through autograph letters to various rulers, his decision to incorporate Bosnia and Herzegovina definitively within his empire. These were Turkish provinces, handed over by the Congress of Berlin in 1878 to Austria-Hungary for "occupation" and administration, though they still remained officially under the suzerainty of the Porte. On October 5th Prince Ferdinand of Bulgaria proclaimed, amid great ceremony, the complete independence of Bulgaria from Turkish suzerainty, and assumed the title of King. Two days later the Greek population of the island of Crete repudiated all connection with Turkey and declared for union with Greece. On the same day, October 7th, Francis Joseph issued a proclamation to the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina announcing the annexation of those provinces. Against this action Servia protested vigorously to the powers, her parliament was immediately convoked, and the war spirit flamed up and threatened to get beyond control. Ferdinand was prepared to

Bulgaria declares her independence.

defend the independence of Bulgaria by going to war with Turkey, if necessary.

These startling events immediately aroused intense excitement throughout Europe. They constituted violent breaches of the Treaty of Berlin. The crisis precipitated by the actions of Austria-Hungary and Bulgaria brought all the great powers, signatories of that treaty, upon the scene. It became quickly apparent that they did not agree. Germany made it clear that she would support Austria, and Italy seemed likely to do the same. The Triple Alliance, therefore, remained firm. In another group were Great Britain, France, and Russia, their precise position not clear, but plainly irritated at the defiance of the Treaty of Berlin. A tremendous interchange of diplomatic notes ensued, of which the public is not fully informed.

The powers do not prevent these breaches of the Berlin Treaty.

Gradually, however, the situation cleared, and the war cloud, the most threatening that had loomed over Europe in many years, disappeared. On examination and reflection certain facts stood forth indubitable. It was evident that Austria would not recede from the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, that she was prepared for war, and would be supported by Germany. Russia, lamed by the disastrous war with Japan, with her army disorganized and her finances in bad condition, was in no position to play her usual rôle of protector of the Balkan Slavs. Moreover, she was bound by a treaty with Austria, which had hitherto been known only to a few, to consent to the very action Austria had taken. Great Britain and France were not disposed or able to go to war with the two great military monarchies of central Europe, even had the reason seemed sufficient. On the other hand, as signatories of the Treaty of Berlin, they could not consent to the flouting of that agreement by one of its parties without a serious loss of self-respect and prestige. Meanwhile, the Turks protested against these infractions of their rights, but with admirable self-control refrained from warlike acts.

The British Foreign Minister, Sir Edward Grey, announced that Great Britain could not admit "the right of any power to alter an international treaty without the consent of the other parties to it, and it, therefore, refuses to sanction any infraction of the Berlin Treaty and declines to recognize what has been done until the views of the other powers are known, especially those of Turkey, which is more directly concerned than any one else."

Thereupon Turkey and Bulgaria announced themselves as in favor of peace. Austria-Hungary let it be known that, while she would not give up the annexation of the provinces, she was not unwilling to compensate Turkey for their loss. The Greeks manifested a disposition to wait a while before consummating their plan in regard to Crete. Russia, France, and England urged the calling of a congress to take the whole subject under consideration, a suggestion which was not accepted. Since November 1908 the tangle has been unraveling. Austria-Hungary and Bulgaria are negotiating with Turkey for the recognition of the *status quo*, willing to indemnify Turkey by cash payments for her losses.

Servia.

Of all the states the most aggrieved is Servia, and the most helpless. For years the Servians have entertained the ambition of uniting Servia, Bosnia, Herzegovina, and Montenegro, peopled by members of the same Servian race, thus restoring the Servian empire of the Middle Ages, and gaining access to the sea. This plan is blocked, apparently forever. Servia cannot expand to the west, as Austria bars the way with Bosnia and Herzegovina. She cannot reach the sea. She alone of all the states in Europe, with the exception of Switzerland, is in this predicament. Thus she can get her products to market only with the consent of other nations. Feeling that she must thus become a vassal state, probably to her enemy, Austria-Hungary, seeing all possibility of expansion ended, all hopes of combining the Serbs of the Balkans under her banner frustrated, the feeling

was strong that war, even against desperate odds, was preferable to strangulation.

The remarkable aspect of the whole history was that the reforming Young Turk party was able to survive blows so damaging to Turkey's prestige, to pursue a moderate policy when a warlike one would have been most natural.

Opening of the Turkish Parliament.

Meanwhile, the new Turkish Parliament had been chosen, and was formally opened by the Sultan on December 17, 1908, amid great enthusiasm. It consisted of two chambers, a Senate, appointed by the Sultan, and a Chamber of Deputies, elected by the people, in the ratio of one member for every fifty thousand males of the population.

But shortly events of a startling nature occurred, which seemed to mean the abrupt termination of this experiment in constitutional and parliamentary government, and to seal the doom of the Young Turks. Their power rested on their control of the army. Suddenly that control appeared to vanish.

The counter-revolution of April, 1909.

On April 13, 1909, without warning, thousands of troops in Constantinople broke into mutiny, denounced the Young Turks as tyrants, surrounded the Parliament House and the War Office, and demanded the removal of the ministry and of the president of the Chamber of Deputies. Constantinople was in a panic. There was much looting of houses and some loss of life. The Minister of Justice was killed, the Minister of Marine was wounded. Prominent Young Turk leaders fled for their lives. The city was terrorized. At the same time sickening massacres occurred in Asia Minor, particularly at Adana, showing that the religious and racial animosities of former times had lost none of their force. It seemed that the new régime was about to founder utterly. A counter-revolution was to undo the work of the revolution of July.

The Young Turks regain control.

But the counter-revolution lasted just eleven days. The Young Turks did not lie down supinely, but at once joined issue with the insurgents. Mobilizing quickly the troops which were loyal to them in Salonika, Adrianople, and other

places they began a march upon the capital, resolved to wrest it from the grasp of the reactionary party. They entered it on April 24th, and after many hours of fighting gained complete control. Thus, for the first time since 1453, Constantinople was taken by an attacking army. It is interesting to note that the rapid interplay of nation upon nation, so striking a characteristic of the present age, was illustrated here. The method followed in the capture of the city was suggested by a chief of staff, who had seen it applied successfully by the Japanese in Manchuria during the war with Russia.

The Young Turks were again in power. Holding that the mutiny had been inspired and organized by the Sultan, who had corrupted the troops so that he might restore the old régime, they resolved to terminate his rule. On April 27th Abdul Hamid II was deposed, and was immediately taken as a prisoner of state to Salonika, a city intensely loyal to the reformers. Thus ended a reign of thirty-three years, a shameful chapter in Turkish history. Under Abdul Hamid II Turkey had lost extensive territories—Servia, Bulgaria, Bosnia, Herzegovina, Crete, Cyprus, and, for all practical purposes, Egypt and the Soudan; had experienced extreme demoralization in every branch of the public service; and had become virtually bankrupt. Only in the army had any constructive work been accomplished. This, remodeled and drilled by German officers, had revealed its quality in the Turco-Greek War of 1897, and is now an efficient instrument for progress in the hands of the reformers.

Deposition of Abdul Hamid II.

Abdul Hamid II was succeeded by his brother, whom he had kept imprisoned many years. The new Sultan, Mohammed V, was in his sixty-fourth year. He at once expressed his entire sympathy with the aims of the Young Turks, his intention to be a constitutional monarch.

Mohammed V.

Thus the Young Turks find their power consolidated and increased as a result of these events. Whether they will

be able to raise an ignorant and impoverished people, debased by long misrule, to a state of enlightenment and prosperity, will be able to render them capable of self-government, the future alone can tell. Even if they reveal the mighty statesmanship required, will they be permitted to work out their own salvation? Will the European powers abandon the ambitions they have cherished for centuries of aggrandizement at the expense of Turkey? Is not the real reformation of the Turkish Empire the last thing they desire? Will they not take advantage of future troubles likely to arise? Will they, indeed, not cause troubles themselves in order, under their cover, to advance their own interests? The Eastern Question is probably not yet solved.

Meanwhile, the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina by Austria-Hungary, and the independence of Bulgaria, have been formally recognized by the signatories of the Treaty of Berlin.

CHAPTER XXIX

RUSSIA TO THE WAR WITH JAPAN

THE REIGN OF ALEXANDER I

Russia in 1815 was the largest state in Europe, and was a still larger Asiatic empire. It extended in unbroken stretch from the German Confederation to the Pacific Ocean. Its population was about 45,000,000. Its European territory covered about 2,000,000 square miles. It was inhabited by a variety of races, but the principal one was the Slavic. Though there were many religions, the religion of the court and of more than two-thirds of the population was the so-called Greek Orthodox form of Christianity. Though various languages were spoken, Russian was the chief one. The Russians had conquered many peoples in various directions. A considerable part of the former Kingdom of Poland had been acquired in the three partitions at the close of the eighteenth century, and more in 1815. Here the people spoke a different language, the Polish, and adhered to a different religion, the Roman Catholic. In the Baltic provinces, Esthonia, Livonia, and Courland, the upper class was of German origin and spoke the German language, while the mass of peasants were Finns and Lithuanians, speaking different tongues. All the inhabitants were Lutherans. Finland had recently been conquered from Sweden. The languages spoken there were Swedish and Finnish, and the religion was Lutheran. To the east and south were peoples of Asiatic origin, many of them Mohammedans in religion. There were in certain sections considerable bodies of Jews.

Russian conquests.

All these dissimilar elements were bound together by their allegiance to the sovereign, the Tsar, a monarch of absolute,

unlimited power. There were two classes of society in Russia—the nobility and the peasantry. The large majority of the latter were serfs of the Tsar and the nobility.

The nobility.

The nobility numbered about 140,000 families. Some of the nobles were very wealthy. It is estimated that 1,500 of them possessed more than a thousand serfs each, that 2,000 others possessed over five hundred each, while 17,000 possessed more than two hundred each. But more than four-fifths of them, that is, about 120,000 were quite poor, with only a few serfs each. The nobles secured offices in the army and the civil service. They were exempt from many taxes, and enjoyed certain monopolies. Their power over their serfs was extensive and despotic. They enforced obedience to their orders by the knout and by banishment to Siberia. The middle class of well-to-do and educated bourgeoisie, increasingly important in the other countries of Europe, practically did not exist in Russia. Russia was an agricultural country, whose agriculture, moreover, was very primitive and inefficient. It was a nation of serfs and of peasants little better off than the serfs. This class was wretched, uneducated, indolent, prone to drink excessively. In the "mir," or village community, however, it possessed a rudimentary form of communism and limited self-government.

The peasantry.

Over this vast and ill-equipped nation ruled the Autocrat of All the Russias, or Tsar, an absolute monarch, whose decisions, expressed in the form of ukases or decrees, were the law of the land. The ruler in 1815 was Alexander I, a man thirty-eight years of age. Ascending the throne in 1801, he played a commanding rôle in the later Napoleonic era. Under him Russia took a leading part in the politics and wars of Europe. Allied with Napoleon in 1807, he broke away from him in 1811, and from that time was his constant and powerful foe. In early life he had had as tutor Colonel Laharpe, a Swiss, who inspired principles of liberalism and humanitarianism in the mind of his quick and receptive pupil.

Alexander I, 1777-1825.

For several years after his accession he followed a progressive and reforming policy. The times, however, were not propitious for any sweeping changes. From 1805 to 1815 Russia was almost incessantly at war, and it is estimated that she lost in these wars nearly a million and a quarter of men, most of whom died from sickness or the privations of war, rather than in battle. The national debt and the burden of taxation had necessarily been immensely augmented. Moreover, blocking the way of reform was an administrative service thoroughly honeycombed with corruption, so that even the official historian of the period after 1815 could only say, "Everything was corrupt, everything unjust, everything dishonest." Such conditions constituted a serious restraint upon the initiative and work of the ruler.

The corruption of the government.

In 1815 Alexander I stood forth as the most liberal sovereign on any of the great thrones of Europe. In the reorganization of Europe in 1814 and 1815 he was, on the whole, a liberal force. He it was who insisted upon reasonably generous terms to France, on the part of the victorious allies; who insisted that Louis XVIII should grant constitutional liberties to the French people; who, at the Congress of Vienna, favored, though ineffectually, the aspirations of the German people for a larger political life.

He showed his liberal tendencies even more unmistakably in his Polish policy. He succeeded at the Congress of Vienna in securing most of the Grand Duchy of Warsaw, which he now transformed into the Kingdom of Poland. This was a state of 3,000,000 inhabitants, with an area less than one-sixth the size of the former Polish kingdom, but containing the Polish capital, Warsaw. This was henceforth to be an independent kingdom, not a part of Russia. The only connection between the two was in the person of the ruler. The Tsar of Russia was to be King of Poland. Alexander intended to make this revived, though incomplete,

Poland.

Poland, a constitutional state. He granted a constitution in 1815, which created a Diet of two chambers, to meet every two years, and to have the power to make laws and to examine the budget. He granted liberty of the press and of religion. The Polish language was to be the official language in the administration and in the army. Poland enjoyed freer institutions at this moment than did either Prussia or Austria. The franchise was wider than that of England or France. Apparently, also, Alexander considered his Polish experiment as preliminary to an introduction of similar reforms in Russia also.

Alexander's progressive domestic policy.

Returning to Russia from Warsaw, Alexander showed in many ways his desire to be a progressive and beneficent ruler. He thought much on what was long the fundamental problem of Russia, the emancipation of the serfs. There were 16,000,000 peasants on the vast domains that belonged to the Crown alone. The condition of these he sought to improve. But the general problem was so vast, his own will so unsteady, that it was solved neither by him nor by his successor. It was, however, a fact of importance that a Tsar had conspicuously indicated that this was the great national evil, which must be removed before Russia could become either free or progressive. The Emperor's opinion could not fail to have a formative influence. Alexander devoted his attention also to healing the wounds and repairing the waste of the long wars. His activity was incessant and varied. He endeavored to make the administration efficient, and to hunt out and punish corruption, which had flourished abundantly during his long absences and his preoccupation with foreign affairs and war, but his success was slight. Prison reform was undertaken. Hospitals and asylums received generous support. That famine might be avoided, in a country where transportation was very difficult owing to poor roads, he gave orders for the establishment in every district of magazines of corn. He encouraged foreign commerce.

In foreign policy, also, Alexander threw his influence on the side of liberalism, in France, in Germany, in Italy, even in Spain; supporting through his agents in those countries those who wished constitutional forms of government. Consequently, for some time, he was the main obstacle in the path of Metternich, the apostle of reaction. As Metternich, however, possessed the stronger character, and as Alexander was easily discouraged, the result of their rivalry was ultimately the triumph of the former. Metternich had exercised little influence over Alexander at the Congress of Vienna in 1814-1815, but three years later, at the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle, he ceaselessly played upon the Emperor's essentially timid nature, pointing out the significance of liberalism, how it ended in anarchy, the loss of respect of all human authority, how in the interest of civilization it must be stamped out. Illustrations were forthcoming to point the argument; the election to the French Chamber of Deputies of Radicals; the actions of the German students; the murder of Kotzebue, one of the Tsar's own agents; the mutiny of one of the St. Petersburg regiments; the spread of secret societies. The Tsar was won to a policy of repression, and his support was after 1818 the main bulwark of Metternich's policy of intervention, which expressed itself in the various congresses and which made the name of the Holy Alliance a by-word among liberals. Events at home further altered the Tsar's domestic policy. He became disappointed over the failure of his attempts to give Poland constitutional liberty. Those attempts were always unpopular in Russia. Why should Poland, the old and dangerous enemy, be favored by generous concessions not awarded to Russia herself? Would not such liberty be used simply to build up the former nation to the detriment of Russia? Russian absolutists and reactionaries were opposed on principle to all constitutions, and feared that the Tsar's experiment might be a step toward the introduction of a constitutional régime in Russia itself. The actions of the Poles served this party

Liberal foreign policy.

Alexander becomes reactionary.

Friction with the Poles.

well, for they took their liberties seriously, and the Diet criticised freely the proposals of the Government. The Tsar, feeling that those whom he had favored were ungrateful, and swinging to the conservative side in general, began to cool. The Diet rejected in 1820 a measure submitted by the Government. Alexander then modified the constitution, and restricted the freedom he had granted by excluding the public from the sessions of the Diet and forbidding the publication of its debates. The liberal period of a brief five years was soon over.

Death of Alexander I.

The Poles replied by conspiring. Profoundly depressed by what he regarded as the ingratitude of the world, and skilfully terrified by Metternich's analysis of the unrest of the times, Alexander became more and more reactionary, and when he died, on December 1, 1825, he left an administration dominated by a totally different spirit from that which had prevailed in the earlier years. The period from 1820 to 1825 was one of reaction and repression throughout his dominions.

THE REIGN OF NICHOLAS I

Alexander left no son to succeed him. His nearest heir was his brother Constantine, who, however, had secretly renounced the crown. Alexander had designated his younger brother, Nicholas, as his successor. The documents, however, making this disposition had never been published. The result was confusion and uncertainty for some weeks. Nicholas refused to mount the throne, and took the oath of allegiance to Constantine. Some days elapsed before Constantine renounced his rights publicly. The opportunity was seized by many malcontents and by the secret societies which had grown up under Alexander. They attempted to effect a revolution, whose precise aim was not clear. This was finally put down by bloodshed in the streets of St. Petersburg. Punishment was meted out to the ringleaders with great severity. Several were hanged, others were banished to

the Ural mines or to Siberia. This revolt of December (1825) only strengthened the hold of absolutism upon Russia by deepening the hostility of the new ruler to all liberalism, associated in his mind with disloyalty and anarchy.

Nicholas I, 1796-1855.

Nicholas I was in his thirtieth year at the time of his accession. His reign covered a generation, 1825-1855, and was eventful. His training had not been in politics or administration, but in the army. His mind was practical, narrow, rigid, and exceedingly conservative. He sought to eradicate abuses wherever he discovered them, but in so vast and centralized yet ill-compacted an empire it was impossible for the Emperor to control effectively the details of the government. His policy was uncompromisingly absolutistic, both at home and abroad. He was the great bulwark of monarchical authority in Europe for thirty years.

Systematic repression.

He carried out systematically and persistently that scheme of reaction into which Alexander had drifted during the closing years of his reign. He sought to give an entirely Russian tone to every aspect of Russian life. His predecessors since Peter the Great had sought Russia's advancement in imitation of western Europe, in the introduction of western customs and ideals and institutions. Nicholas planted himself right athwart this traditional tendency. Russia must be self-sufficient; must find within herself the fundamental, active principles of her life.

For thirty years a system of remorseless, undeviating repression was steadily carried out. The two principal instruments employed were the secret police and the censorship.

The police system.

The former, under the name of the Third Section, possessed practically unlimited powers of life and death, could arrest, imprison, exile, or execute without let or hindrance.

The censorship.

The censorship was elaborately and minutely organized, and was most effective in stamping out freedom of the press and of speech, though making itself ridiculous by the senseless zeal with which it pursued its work. Musical

notes were investigated on the ground that conspirators might be using them as ciphers for malevolent purposes. It was decreed that books on anatomy and physiology should contain nothing that could offend the sense of decency. Punishments were of great severity. The most harmless word might mean exile to Siberia, without any kind of preliminary trial. The rigor of this régime increased as the reign wore on. To rivet it still tighter, that vigilance should never sleep, a committee was appointed in 1848 to watch over the censors, and later another committee to watch over the first. It has been estimated that in the twenty years between 1832 and 1852 probably 150,000 persons were exiled to Siberia, suffering fearful hardships on the way and after arrival, condemned, as they generally were, to work in the mines. In addition, tens of thousands languished in the prisons of Russia.

Safeguards against the ideas of western Europe.

Needless to say, under such a system no such thing as a free press or a free reading public could possibly exist. In 1843 all the Russian journals combined did not have more than 12,000 subscribers. That Russians might not be contaminated by the pernicious liberal ideas of the west, their travel abroad was greatly restricted by a system of passports. These passports were expensive, and were only granted on the consent of the sovereign, and then only for a maximum period of five years. Any one outstaying the time permitted might have his property in Russia confiscated. On the other hand, the travel in Russia of foreigners was elaborately discouraged. Such travelers must obtain passports from the Russian government, must explain why they were visiting that country, and during their entire sojourn were under police surveillance.

A brilliant native literature.

Foreign literature of a liberal nature was rigorously excluded. While Nicholas I encouraged Russian literature in the forms that seemed harmless, while his reign was called the "Augustan age of Russia," rendered notable by the poetry of Pushkin, the novels of Dostoievski, Turgenieff, and

Gogol, while he encouraged research in lines which he considered legitimate, and showed his humanitarianism by abolishing capital punishment, except for high treason, at a time when the English penal code was barbarous in its severity, and while he encouraged the building of railways, so that at the time of his death there were 632 miles in operation, his reign was, on the whole, one of repression and national stagnation. As we have seen, Russia was as completely as possible shut off from the outside world. No attempt was made even to connect the railways with the systems of western Europe. In later years, regarding educational institutions as "hotbeds of revolution," he practically limited the number of students at any Russian university, with the exception of those pursuing courses in medicine, to three hundred. The result was that in 1853, in a country whose population was about 70,000,000, there were only about 2,900 students. Religious persecution accompanied political and intellectual. Any one renouncing the Orthodox religion was punished with loss of property and with eight to ten years of hard labor. Any one attempting to convert an Orthodox believer was imprisoned from eight to sixteen months, and, for the third offense, was exiled to Siberia. Nicholas, like his predecessor, was alive to the evils of serfdom, and during his reign six committees were appointed to study the problem, but almost nothing was accomplished. "I do not understand," he once said, speaking as "the first nobleman in Russia," "how man came to be a thing, and I can explain the fact only by deception on one side and ignorance on the other. We must make an end to this. It is better we should give up, of our own account, that which might otherwise be wrested from us."

Religious persecution.

The evil of serfdom.

Nicholas's foreign policy was marked by the same characteristics, and made him hated throughout Europe as the most brutal autocrat of Europe. Nicholas suppressed the Polish insurrection of 1830-31, abolished the constitution granted by Alexander I, and incorporated Poland in Russia,

The foreign policy of Nicholas I.

thus ending the history of that kingdom, a history of only fifteen years. He waged two wars against Turkey, previously described, one in 1828-9, and one in 1853-6. He interfered decisively to suppress the Hungarian revolutionists in 1849, and in German affairs he was a factor of importance. His prestige was great after 1849. Russia, alone of the great powers, had passed through the turbulent years of 1848 and 1849 without commotion. She had aided in the restoration of the established order elsewhere. Her army, on which nearly forty per cent. of her income was annually expended, was supposed by Nicholas and by many outside of Russia to be the best in Europe. The Crimean war, in which Nicholas became involved in 1854, proved the hollowness of this claim. That war was an overwhelming and disillusioning defeat for Russia. Sebastopol finally fell after a famous siege. Russia had lost more than 250,000 lives, and had incurred an enormous expenditure. Another campaign and the Empire might dissolve into the elements from which it had been created. The prestige of Russia, so overwhelming since Napoleon's flight from Moscow, was completely shattered. The people had acquiesced in the narrow, iron régime of Nicholas, consoling themselves with the belief that their country was the greatest in Europe, that their army was invincible, that their sovereign was the most powerful monarch on the Continent. The falsity of all this was now apparent. The Government was shown to be as incompetent and impotent as it was reactionary. The military organization was clearly as honeycombed with abuses as the civil. Though the soldiers were brave, the generals were incapable, the officials corrupt, the commissary department a field of endless robbery.

The Crimean war.

The humiliation of Russia.

But in this great national humiliation lay the best hope of the future. As Prussia arose and reformed her institutions after Jena, so did Russia after the Crimean war. That war is a landmark in her history, as it inaugurated a period of extensive reorganization and improvement.

THE REIGN OF ALEXANDER II

Nicholas died in 1855, and was succeeded by his son, Alexander II, who ruled from 1855 to 1881. The new Emperor was in his thirty-seventh year at the time of his accession. He had received a varied training, designed to equip him for rule. Of an open mind, and desirous of ameliorating the conditions of Russian life, he for some years followed a policy of reform. He relaxed the censorship of the press, and removed most of the restrictions which had been imposed upon the universities and upon travel. Particularly did he address himself to the question of serfdom.

Alexander II, 1818-1881.

To understand the significance of the Edict of Emancipation, which was to constitute Alexander II's most legitimate title to fame, one must first understand the previous system of land tenure. Nearly all, practically nine-tenths, of the arable land was owned by the crown and the royal princes, and by the one hundred and forty thousand families of the nobility. The land was, therefore, generally held in large estates. It was owned by a small minority; it was tilled by the millions of Russia, who were serfs.

Prevailing system of land tenure.

The method of cultivation was as follows: each estate was, as a rule, divided into two parts; one part reserved by the owner for his own use, and cultivated directly under his supervision; the other assigned to his serfs. These serfs generally lived in small villages, going out into the fields to till them, returning to their villages at night. The village communities, or mirs, regulated for their members the cultivation of those lands especially allotted to them. The serfs did not own the land, but enjoyed the usufruct of it, were entitled to whatever they raised. In return the mir paid the landlord a fixed sum annually. About one-half of the mirs were on crown lands, one-half on lands belonging to the nobility.

The mir.

Serfdom, previously abolished in all other European countries, still flourished in Russia, and was the basis of the

The serfs.

economic and social life. The serfs numbered about fifty millions, about 23,000,000 on the crown domains, about 23,000,000 on the estates of the nobility, and over 3,000,000 on the appanages of the imperial family and in private service as house domestics and attendants. The serfs cultivated, then, the lands allotted to the mir, and from what they raised they got their sustenance. But they also cultivated the portion set apart for the landlord's own use. They must labor for him three days a week. They were not slaves in the strict sense of the word. They could not be sold separately. But they were attached to the soil, could not leave it without the consent of the owner, and passed, if he sold his estate, to the new owner. The landlord had the right to inflict corporal punishment, which right, though legally restricted, was practically uncontrolled. If he considered any of his serfs unduly troublesome he could usually get the government to force them into the army, or send them to Siberia. In practice, the authority of the proprietor was unlimited. The peasant had the use, but not the ownership, of enough land to support himself and family; but otherwise he was not his own master.

Serfdom condemned.

Serfdom was condemned on various grounds. It was morally harmful in that it offended the conscience of the age. Economically it had not proved successful. Two-thirds of the estates of private owners were mortgaged up to their full value, and while serfdom was not alone the cause of this, it was one of the causes. Yet the institution had influential support. The nobles looked upon their serfs as the chief source of their income. It was customary in speaking of a nobleman's wealth not to say that he possessed so many acres, or had an income of so many rubles a year, but that he possessed so many hundreds of "souls." It is no occasion for surprise, therefore, that although the Emperor, Alexander II, attacked the question immediately after the close of the Crimean war, several years elapsed before it was solved.

The crown serfs were in a better position than the serfs on private estates. Practically, their only obligation was to pay certain dues each year to the State or the imperial family, which were considerably smaller than those paid by the others to their lords. They were, in a sense, tenants, owing the equivalent of rent. To free them, all that was necessary was to abolish these dues, and to recognize the serfs as owners of the holdings, which they had been cultivating, and to grant them personal freedom. No one could question the right of the State to do what it would with its own. The liberation of these serfs was begun in 1859, though the process was not completed until 1866. Another class, those in domestic service, could easily be freed, but the class belonging to private landlords and attached to the soil presented greater difficulties, for it was not simply a question of giving them civil freedom, but it was a question of giving them land as well. The Edict of Emancipation concerned the serfs of private landowners, the nobles. Issued March 3, 1861, it abolished serfdom throughout the Empire, freeing about twenty-three million serfs, thus winning for Alexander the title of "the Tsar Liberator." This manifesto did not merely declare the serfs free men. It undertook to solve the far more difficult problem of the ownership of the soil. The Tsar felt that merely to give the serfs freedom, and to leave all the land in the possession of the nobles, would mean the creation of a great proletariat possessing no property, therefore likely to fall at once into a position of economic dependence upon the nobles, which would make the gift of freedom a mere mockery. Moreover, the peasants were firmly convinced that they were the rightful owners of the lands which they and their ancestors for centuries had lived upon and cultivated, and the fact that the landlords were legally the owners did not alter their opinion. To give them freedom without land, leaving that with the nobles, who desired to retain it, would be bitterly resented as making their condition worse than ever.

The Crown serfs.

The Edict of Emancipation.

The land problem.

On the other hand, to give them the land with their freedom would mean the ruin of the nobility as a class, considered essential to the state. The consequence of this conflict of interests was a compromise, satisfactory to neither party, but more favorable to the nobility than to the peasants.

Division of the land.

The lands were divided into two parts. The landlords were to keep one; the other was to go to the peasants in the following manner: the house and lot of each peasant was to become his personal property; the lands surrounding the village were to become the property of the village, or mir, to be owned by the community collectively, but to be divided periodically among its members, according to the Russian fashion.[1] Such divisions were made by lot, and were merely temporary, for a period, varying in different districts, from three to twelve years, and varying also with the size of the family. Collective ownership of general farming land, private ownership of house and lot, were thus the modes of land tenure adopted at the Emancipation. But the lands, those going to the peasants individually, and those going to the mir collectively, were not given to them out-

State aid.

right. The peasant and the mir must pay the landlord for their respective acquisitions. As they could not do this themselves, the State was to advance the money, which was to be paid back in instalments during a period of forty-nine years. The principle was the same as that applied later in the land purchase laws for Ireland. Thus in time the peasants would become individually and collectively the owners of a part of the soil, yet the former landowner would be paid for what was taken from him.[2]

Disappointment of the peasantry.

This arrangement was a great disappointment to the peasantry. Their newly acquired freedom seemed a doubtful boon in the light of this method of dividing the land. In-

[1] This arrangement applied only to those regions where communal ownership was customary, namely the north, east, and south of Russia. Where individual ownership was the rule, as in Little Russia and Poland, the land was apportioned directly to individuals.

[2] Domestic serfs were given freedom, but not land.

deed, the peasant could not see that he was profiting from the change. Personal liberty could not mean much, when the conditions of earning a livelihood became harder rather than lighter. The peasant ceased to be bound to the landlord, but he was bound to the mir all the more closely, because the mir was bound to the State for at least forty-nine years by its obligation to pay the State for the communal lands. This meant, concretely, a heavy land tax on each peasant. Was anything gained in becoming a kind of serf to the State at the moment of ceasing to be the serf of a nobleman? The peasants regarded the land as their own. But the State guaranteed forever a part to the landlords, and announced that the peasants must pay for the part assigned to themselves. To the peasants this seemed sheer robbery. Moreover, as the division worked out, they found that they had less land for their own use than in the pre-emancipation days, and that they had to pay the landlords, through the State, more than the lands which they did receive were worth. Moreover, as they were not permitted to leave the mir and seek their fortunes elsewhere, even the personal liberty guaranteed by emancipation seemed hollow. Evidently this could be no final solution of the land question for a country almost entirely agricultural. The agrarian question, indeed, became steadily more and more acute during the next fifty years, and constitutes to-day one of the most difficult problems in the revolution now in progress. The peasant population has in that time vastly increased, and the pressure upon the land has consequently grown greater. At present the peasant has only on an average half as much land as he had in 1861. He lives necessarily upon the verge of starvation.

The land question not solved.

The emancipation of the serfs is seen, therefore, not to have been an unalloyed boon. Yet Russia gained morally in the esteem of other nations by abolishing an indefensible wrong. Theoretically, at least, every man was free. Moreover, the peasants, though faring ill, yet fared better than

had the peasants of Prussia and Austria at the time of their liberation.[1]

Establishment of zemstvos.

The abolition of serfdom was the greatest act of Alexander II's reign, but it was only one of several liberal measures enacted at this time of general enthusiasm. In 1864 the Emperor issued a decree establishing a certain measure of self-government. This decree was based upon investigations made by a commission appointed in 1859. Russia is divided into provinces and the provinces are subdivided into districts. In each district a popular assembly was now established, called the zemstvo, to be chosen by the landowners, the bourgeois, and the peasants in the villages. The district zemstvos were to choose representatives, who were to form provincial zemstvos. The zemstvos were to meet regularly once a year, and were to aid the Government in administration. They were not to be political bodies. It was not the intention of the Emperor to divide or reduce in any degree his autocratic power.

Duties of the zemstvos.

They were to serve as a part of the local administration, discharging certain functions which the smaller areas, the mirs, could not adequately perform, such as the control of the public highways, primary schools and hospitals, and the taking of precautions against famine; in short, to contribute within strict limits to the material and moral well-being of the people. These zemstvos were introduced gradually during the next twelve years, from 1864 to 1876.

Much accomplished by the zemstvos.

"The zemstvo," says a leading authority, "has done a great deal to provide medical aid and primary education for the common people, and it has improved wonderfully the condition of the hospitals, lunatic asylums, and other benevolent institutions committed to its charge. In its efforts to aid the peasantry it has helped to improve the native breeds of horses and cattle, and it has created a system of obligatory fire insurance, together

[1] On the attitude of the nobility and peasantry toward the Emancipation see Wallace, Russia (Revised Edition 1905), 442-451. On general discussion of effects see Wallace, 452-490.

with means for preventing and extinguishing fires in the villages, a most important matter in a country where the peasants live in wooden houses, and big fires are fearfully frequent." [1]

Though not intended as political or legislative bodies, but simply as aids to the State in business matters, the zemstvos have, nevertheless, been training schools in political co-operation. Though their activity has been interrupted, restricted, nullified, more or less by the central government, yet they have persisted, have struck root in the life of the nation, and have contributed to the political education of the people.

Reform of the judicial system.

This reform in administration was followed by one in the judicial system (November 1864), based upon a study of the systems of Europe and the United States. The judicial organization was both corrupt and inefficient. Judges were poorly paid, and might be removed at any moment; trials were conducted behind closed doors and in writing, a method which greatly facilitated bribery, a system favorable to the rich, oppressive to the poor. Henceforth, it was provided, that judges should serve during good behavior, that court proceedings should be public and oral, and that trial by jury should be instituted for criminal cases. Whatever its shortcomings, the new system was a great improvement on the old.

Educational reform.

Other lesser reforms were also carried through at this time. The censorship of the press was somewhat relaxed, the universities were released from certain restrictions imposed during the reign of Nicholas I, and secondary education was improved. Schools emphasizing scientific education were founded. In 1858 the first high school for girls was opened, and in the course of six years nearly a hundred others were established.

End of the era of reform.

This hopeful era of reform was, however, soon over, and a period of reaction began, which characterized the latter half of Alexander's reign and ended in his assassination in

[1] Wallace, Russia, 500-501.

1881. There were several causes for this change: the vacillating character of the monarch himself, taking fright at his own work; the disappointment felt by many who had expected a millennium, but who found it not; the intense dislike of the privileged and conservative classes of the measures just described, a dislike which could express itself in acts, inasmuch as the Tsar confided the execution of his measures mainly to them. As a matter of fact these measures were, in application, distorted and even partially nullified. The reformers, hitherto a solid body, now split up into groups. Public opinion, the motive force behind all these changes, divided and became less certain. The landlords, smarting under the loss of their serfs, the serfs disappointed at the loss of some of the land which they had been accustomed to cultivate, and indignant at having to pay for the land which they had acquired, were elements of disaffection.

The Polish insurrection of 1863.

Just at this time, when the attitude of the Emperor was changing, when public opinion was in this fluid, uncertain state, occurred an event which immensely strengthened the reactionary forces, a new insurrection of Poland. After the failure of their attempt to achieve independence in 1831 the Poles had remained quiet, the quiet of despair. As long as Nicholas I lived they were ruled with the greatest severity, and they could not but see the impracticability of any attempt to throw off their chains. But the accession of Alexander II aroused hopes of better conditions. The spirit of nationalism revived, greatly encouraged by the success of the same spirit elsewhere. The Italians had just realized their aspiration, the creation of an Italian nation—not solely by their own efforts, but by the aid of foreign nations. Might not the Poles hope for as much? Alexander would not for a moment entertain the favorite idea of the Poles, that they should be independent. He emphatically told them that such a notion was an idle dream, that they "must abandon all thoughts of independence, now and forever impossible." He would continue his

father's policy, as all that he had done had been "rightly done." In practice for several years, Alexander's policy was one calculated to agitate and arouse, without satisfying, the Poles. Concessions of a liberal nature were made them, only to be followed by acts regarded as oppressive or hostile. The result was that the irritation of the Poles increased, that misunderstandings multiplied, and that finally, in 1863, an insurrection broke out. It was in no sense as formidable as that of 1831. The Poles had now no army, no native government, no treasury. They had been since 1832 completely incorporated in Russia. At no time during this insurrection did they control even their capital, Warsaw, which remained in the power of the regular Russian officials and army. The fighting was entirely guerrilla in character. The aim of the Poles was to make Poland independent. This involved not only making the Poland of that day a nation, but adding to it the Lithuanian provinces to the east, formerly a part of Poland, but for ninety years, since the first partition in 1772, incorporated in Russia proper. At once the intense national feeling of the Russians was aroused by what seemed to threaten dismemberment of the Empire. Religious fanaticism was also aroused. The Poles were Roman Catholics, whereas the Russians belonged to the Orthodox Greek Church. Thus the Poles stood for schism in religion, as in politics. The Tsar, consequently, in his determination to crush this separatist spirit, had the support of tremendous national passions, and his campaign was conducted with vigor and without mercy. The only hope for the Poles lay in foreign intervention. In this they were bitterly disappointed. England, France, and Austria intervened three times in their behalf, but only by diplomatic notes, making no attempt to give emphasis to their notes by a show of force. Russia, seeing this, and supported by Prussia, treated their intervention as an impertinence, and proceeded to wreak her vengeance. It was a fearful punishment she meted out.

The aims of the Poles.

The Poles receive no foreign aid.

The deep-seated divisions of the Poles.

The deep-seated historic evil of Polish nationality was the division of the people into two classes, completely alienated from each other—the nobles and the peasants. Indeed, the Poles were practically two peoples. The fusion of the two had never been consummated. The nobles were the dominant class, and were regarded by the peasants as despots and oppressors. As a consequence, the Polish people did not act together as a whole. The insurrection of 1863, like its predecessors, was the work of the nobles. The peasants remained inactive, unmoved by the appeals of those who turned to them only in adversity, but who treated them contemptuously and harshly in ordinary times. The Tsar determined to use this, the fundamental fact of Polish life, as a means of crushing the Polish nobility, the turbulent insurrectionary class, by making the Polish peasants friendly to Russia. This he accomplished by a decree of March 1864, which effected a sweeping agrarian change. Practically half of the nobles' lands were given to the peasants as freeholds. The peasants were released from all obligation to cultivate the estates which remained the property of the nobles. At the same time no change was made in the peasants' former right to use the nobles' forest and pasture lands, a right very indefinite and yet real. This right was now preserved to them as tending to win their good will still more, and also as likely to keep friction alive between the nobles and the peasants, which in turn would cause the latter to look constantly to the Tsar for support and protection. The lands taken from the nobles were to be paid for, not by the peasants alone to whom they were transferred, but by a general land tax, which fell upon all lands, that is, upon the lands left to the nobles as well as those now given to the peasants. The result was that the nobles would have to pay a large part of their own compensation, an ingenious method of punishment. The process amounted to a confiscation of a part of their property.

Russia resolves to crush the Polish nobility.

The clergy had supported the nobles in the insurrection. The Russian government punished them by suppressing most of the monasteries and confiscating their lands and by subjecting the priests to political supervision.

A process of Russification was now vigorously pursued. The Russian language was prescribed for the correspondence of the officials and the lectures of the university professors, and the use of Polish was forbidden in churches, schools, theaters, newspapers, in business signs, in fact, everywhere.

A policy of Russification.

The consequences of the Polish insurrection of 1863 were felt in Russia as well. Those who desired a reversal of the Emperor's previous liberal policies and a return to the old methods and conditions were greatly encouraged and strengthened. Not that the Emperor at once abandoned his liberal policy. The great measures concerning the administrative and judicial systems, already described, were promulgated even after this. But Alexander II, always vacillating, was troubled by these events. Reaction was hastened by two attempts to assassinate him, one in 1866, and the other in 1867. The Tsar, hitherto liberal, became reactionary. The execution of the reform measures described above was entrusted, as has been said, to those who were anxious to limit them, or completely to destroy them, and thus it came about that they were only partially applied, were robbed of some of their essential features. Universities again felt the weight of bureaucratic hostility. The achievements of the reform era were rapidly being undone, and Russia was slipping back into the old familiar ways. This reaction aroused intense discontent and engendered a movement which threatened the very existence of the monarchy itself, namely, Nihilism.

Effect of Polish insurrection upon Alexander II.

The more liberal-minded Russians had followed the reforming policy of the early years of Alexander's reign with great enthusiasm, and after the issuance of the decree establishing the zemstvos they hoped that the Tsar would advance further along the same path and would crown his

Alexander's policy becomes retrogressive.

work with a constitution, and with real parliamentary institutions for the whole Empire. Their optimism was doomed to speedy extinction. When the members of the zemstvos begged the Tsar to grant a representative constitution he rebuked them summarily for mixing in affairs not theirs. Shortly, the zemstvos were told that they were not political bodies, but merely business organizations, designed to attend to the economic interests of their districts. They were forbidden to express political views. They were to be merely administrative organs, subject to the officials of the central government.

Widespread disillusionment.

The retrogressive policy of the later years of Alexander II created a widespread and bitter sense of disappointment and deception, and resulted in the rise of an opposition to the existing form of government. This feeling has passed through several phases, but has constantly become stronger. The first phase was the most pessimistic. The Russians were thrown in upon themselves once more, there being no room in the Russian state for liberal action. Reading the works of the more radical philosophers and scientists of western Europe, and reflecting upon the foundations of their own national institutions and conditions, the "intellectuals," as these men were called, became most destructive critics, and were called Nihilists.

Rise of Nihilism.

"The fundamental principle of Nihilism," says Stepniak, "was absolute individualism. It was the negation, in the name of individual liberty, of all the obligations imposed upon the individual by society, by family life, and by religion." Turgenieff defined a Nihilist as a "man who submits to no authority, who accepts not a single principle upon faith merely, however high such a principle may stand in the eyes of men." The Nihilists were extreme individualists who tested every human institution and custom by reason. As few Russian institutions could meet such a test, the Nihilists condemned them all. Theirs was an attitude, first of intellectual challenge, then of revolt against the whole estab-

lished order. They did not properly form a party of action, but their reckless criticism of government, religion, marriage, ethics brought down upon them the wrath of the authorities. Alarmed, they fled to other countries. The term Nihilist, as a term of opprobrium, has since been applied by the conservatives to all shades and kinds of reformers, most inaccurately.

Persecution of the Nihilists.

Forced to live abroad, mainly in France and Switzerland, the refugees came in contact with other advanced schools of thought. One of these was represented by Bakounine, a Siberian exile, who had escaped and was living in London. Bakounine was an anarchist who advocated the immediate destruction of all existing institutions; governments, churches, the family, private property, codes of law, in the interests of human freedom, "in order that," as he said later, "all these millions of poor human beings who are cheated, enslaved, overworked, and exploited . . . may henceforth and forever breathe in absolute freedom." Shortly, Socialism was grafted upon this hatred of all established institutions, this anarchy of Bakounine. In the place of the existing society, which must be swept away, a new society was to be erected, based on socialistic principles. Thus the movement entered upon a new phase. It ceased to be merely critical and destructive. It became constructive as well, in short, a political party with a positive programme, a party very small but resolute and reckless, willing to resort to any means to achieve its aims.

Bakounine.

This party now determined to institute an educational campaign in Russia, realizing that nothing could be done unless the millions of peasants were shaken out of their stolid acquiescence in the prevalent order which weighed so heavily upon them. This extraordinary movement, called "going in among the people," became very active after 1870. Young men and women, all belonging to the educated class, and frequently to noble families, became day laborers and peasants in order to mingle with the people, to arouse

Nihilist propaganda

them to action, "to found," as one of their documents said, "on the ruins of the present social organization the empire of the working classes." They showed the self-sacrifice, the heroism of the missionary laboring under the most discouraging conditions. A typical case was that of Sophie Bardine, arrested for discussing a socialist pamphlet before a group of workmen. She had for several months been employed in a spinning factory, working fifteen hours a day, and sharing all the hardships of the other women—all this that she might get the chance to preach to them the new ideas. Our aim, she explained later in court, "was to arouse in the conscience of the people the ideal of a better organization, one more conformable to justice; to point out the vices of the present organization in order to prevent the return of the same errors." It is estimated that, between 1872 and 1878, between two and three thousand such missionaries were active in this propaganda. Their efforts, however, were not rewarded with success. The peasantry remained stolid, if not contented. Moreover, this campaign of education and persuasion was broken up wherever possible by the ubiquitous and lawless police. Many were imprisoned or exiled to Siberia.

A policy of terrorism.

A pacific propaganda being impossible, one of violence seemed to the more energetic spirits the only alternative. As the Government held the people in a subjection unworthy of human beings, as it employed all its engines of power against every one who demanded reform of any kind, as, in short, it ruled by terror, these reformers resolved to fight it with terror as the only method possible. The "Terrorists" were not bloodthirsty or cruel by nature. They simply believed that no progress whatever could be made in raising Russia from her misery except by getting rid of the more unscrupulous officials. They perfected their organization and entered upon a period of violence. Numerous attempts, often successful, were made to assassinate the high officials, chiefs of police and others who had rendered themselves

particularly odious. In turn many of the revolutionists were executed.

Activity of the police.

All this redoubled the activity of the authorities, particularly of the dreaded Third Section of the police. In the course of a single winter, 1878-9, it is said that nearly 2,000 arrests were made in St. Petersburg alone. Suspected persons were not allowed witnesses, and were often summarily executed. Thousands were arrested and sent to Siberia without trial, by simple administrative decrees. Finally the terrorists determined to kill the Tsar as the only way of overthrowing the whole hated arbitrary and oppressive system. Several attempts were made. In April 1879 a schoolmaster, Solovief, fired five shots at the Emperor, none of which took effect. In December of the same year a train on which he was supposed to be returning from the Crimea was wrecked, just as it reached Moscow, by a mine placed between the rails. Alexander escaped only because he had reached the capital secretly on an earlier train. The next attempt (February 1880) was to kill him while at dinner in the Winter Palace in St. Petersburg. Dynamite was exploded, ten soldiers were killed and fifty-three wounded in the guardroom directly overhead, and the floor of the dining room was torn up. The Tsar narrowly escaped because he did not go to dinner at the usual hour.

Attempts upon the Emperor's life.

Alexander II and Loris Melikoff.

St. Petersburg was by this time thoroughly terrorized. Alexander now appointed Loris Melikoff practically dictator. Melikoff sought to inaugurate a milder régime. He released hundreds of prisoners, and in many cases commuted the death sentence. He urged the Tsar to grant the people some share in the government, believing that this would kill the Nihilist movement, which was a violent expression of the discontent of the nation with the abuses of an arbitrary and lawless system of government. He urged that this could be done without weakening the principle of autocracy, and that thus Alexander would win back the popularity he had enjoyed during his early reforming years. After much hes-

itation and mental perturbation the Tsar ordered, March 13, 1881, Melikoff's scheme to be published in the official journal. But on that same afternoon, as he was returning from a drive, escorted by Cossacks, a bomb was thrown at his carriage. The carriage was wrecked, and many of his escorts were injured. Alexander escaped as by a miracle, but a second bomb exploded near him as he was going to aid the injured. He was horribly mangled, and died within an hour. Thus perished the Tsar Liberator. At the same time the hopes of the liberals perished also. This act of supreme violence did not intimidate the successor to the throne, Alexander III, whose entire reign was one of stern repression.

Assassination of Alexander II.

THE REIGN OF ALEXANDER III

The man who now ascended the throne of Russia was in the full flush of magnificent manhood. Alexander III, son of Alexander II, was thirty-six years of age, and of powerful physique. His education had been chiefly military. He was a man of firm and resolute rather than large or active mind. He was profoundly religious, and had a deep sense of his responsibility.

Alexander III, 1845-1894.

It shortly became clear that he possessed a strong, inflexible character, that he was a thorough believer in absolutism, and was determined to maintain it undiminished. His most influential adviser was his former tutor, Pobyedonostseff, later for many years Procurator of the Holy Synod, a man who abhorred the liberal ideas of western Europe, and who insisted that Russia must preserve her own native institutions untainted, must follow without deviation her own historic tendency, which he conceived in a strictly nationalistic sense. The orthodoxy of the Greek Church, the absolutism of the monarch, were the fundamental tenets of his belief,—no coquetting with western ideas of representative government and religious and intellectual freedom. The opinions of this man are historically important because he was the power

Rigorous policy of reaction.

Influence of Pobyedonostseff.

behind the throne during all of Alexander III's reign, and during the first ten years of his successor's, the present Emperor's. Of those opinions two, significant and characteristic, may be quoted, the one concerning parliamentary institutions, the other concerning the press, supposed, in western Europe, to be two of the most powerful agencies of progress. "Parliament is an institution serving for the satisfaction of personal ambition, vanity, and self-interest of the members. The institution of Parliament is, indeed, one of the greatest illustrations of human delusion. . . . On the pediment of this edifice is inscribed, 'All for the public good.' This is no more than a lying formula; Parliamentarism is the triumph of egoism—its highest expression." "From the day that man first fell, falsehood has ruled the world, ruled it in human speech, in the practical business of life, in all its relations and institutions. But never did the Father of Lies spin such webs of falsehood of every kind as in this restless age. . . . The press is one of the falsest institutions of our time." [1]

Opposition to the ideas of Western Europe.

Under the influence of such an adviser, and under the sway of his own instincts and his indignation at the insolent demand of the Nihilists that the murderers of his father be not punished as they were merely "executors of a hard civic duty"; influenced, too, no doubt, by the general horror which that event inspired, and the warm evidences of loyalty which it called forth, Alexander assumed an attitude of defiant hostility to innovators and liberals. His reign, which lasted from 1881 to 1894, was one of reversion to the older ideals of government and of unqualified absolutism.

The terrorists were hunted down, and their attempts practically ceased. The press was thoroughly gagged, university professors and students were watched, suspended, exiled, as the case might be. The reforms of Alexander II were in part undone, the zemstvos particularly being more and more restricted, and the secret police, the terrible Third Sec-

The terrorists hunted down.

[1] Pobyedonostseff, Reflections of a Russian Statesman, 35, 62.

tion, being greatly augmented. Liberals gave up all hope of any improvement during this reign, and waited for better days.

Persecution of the Jews.

Many of the subjects of the Emperor felt the hand of the oppressor with excessive severity. Under him began the persecutions of the Jews, which have been so dark a feature of recent Russian history. The chief home of the Jews in the modern world is Russia. Out of about eight and a half million Jews in Europe, over five million live in that country. The Russian Jews had long been restricted to Poland and to the contiguous provinces of Lithuania, called the Jewish Territory, formerly a part of Poland. The Tsar, bigoted, and believing in a policy of Russification of all the varied elements and races of the Empire, looked with disfavor upon a people which held fast its own religion and spoke its own language and maintained its own customs. Under Alexander II the restrictions upon Jewish residence had not been rigorously enforced, and many were living outside the Jewish Territory. These were now ordered back, although suffering and hardship were the inevitable result. Anti-Jewish riots broke out in many places, costing many lives. The Government gave but slight protection; indeed, in many cases the officials appeared to encourage the outbreaks, so popular was Jew-baiting. To keep them out of the liberal professions decrees were issued limiting the number of Jews who might attend the secondary schools and universities—to from three to ten per cent. of the total enrollment according to the region, even though in some of these districts they formed a third or a half of the population. Utterly miserable and insecure, tens of thousands left the country. The great Jewish emigration to the United States dates from this time.

Great Jewish emigration.

Elsewhere, too, in the Baltic provinces, where the dominant element was of German origin, and in Finland, and particularly in Poland, the policy of Russification was vigorously applied. Alexander was offended by the sight within his

Empire of religions, races, and languages not his own, and he steadily endeavored to suppress the variations. Thus by the close of his reign the attempt to force alien peoples to become thoroughly Russian was in process of execution. It was both political and religious. Apparently meeting with a large measure of success, its permanence or profundity was not clear. Widespread, intense, though silent, disaffection was aroused, which would surely express itself if the Government should ever find itself in difficulties. This policy sowed abundant seeds of trouble for the future.

Progressive features of the reign of Alexander III.

While the policy of Alexander III was thus opposed to the intellectual and moral forces of liberalism, and while it was harshly oppressive to the religious dissenters and subject nationalities of alien race, in other directions it was progressive. The Tsar was sincerely interested in the material advancement of his people, and won the title of the Peasants' Emperor. He abolished the poll tax, which has been called "the last relic of serfdom" (January 1884). He partially canceled the dues still owed by the peasants in compensation for lands acquired at the time of the emancipation. He sought to encourage the peasants to emigrate from congested districts to more sparsely populated regions, for the question of subsistence was then, as it still is, a serious problem in Russia. The lands allotted the peasants at the time of their liberation were inadequate then, and have become more inadequate since, owing to the rapid growth of the population. In 1815 the population was about forty-five million, in 1867 over eighty-two, in 1885 over one hundred and eight millions. This growth has been remarkable. In a land with endless agricultural stretches, widespread and terrible famines have frequently occurred.

The industrial revolution.

The most important feature of Alexander's reign was the industrial revolution which began then, and has been carried much further under his successor. Russia had been for centuries an agricultural country whose agriculture, moreover,

was of the primitive type. Whatever industries existed were mainly of the household kind. Russia was one of the poorest countries in the world, her immense resources being undeveloped. Under the system of protection adopted by Alexander II, and continued and increased by Alexander III, industries of a modern kind began to grow up. A tremendous impetus was given to this development by the appointment in 1892 as Minister of Finance and Commerce of Sergius de Witte, one of the most salient personalities in recent Russian history. Witte believed that Russia, the largest and most populous country in Europe, a world in itself, ought to be self-sufficient, that as long as it remained chiefly agricultural it would be tributary to the industrial nations for manufactured articles, that it had abundant resources, in raw material and in labor, to enable it to supply its own needs if they were but developed, that a diversified industrial life would have the further advantage that it would draw laborers from the soil already overtaxed, and would thus render the agrarian problem less acute. To effect this economic transformation, believing thoroughly in a protective tariff, he advised that duties be raised and applied on a wider scale. But that the process of building up the nation's industries might be rapid, it was essential that a large amount of capital should be invested at once in the various industries, and this capital Russia did not possess. One of the cardinal features of Witte's policy was to induce foreign capitalists to invest in Russian factories and mines. He was eminently successful in bringing this about by showing them that they would have the Russian market by reason of the protective system, and by promising, in many cases, large orders from the Government for their products. Immense amounts of foreign capital poured in, and Russia advanced industrially in the closing decade of the nineteenth century with great swiftness. But that these industries might flourish, the markets must be rendered more accessible so that customers could be reached. Russia's greatest lack was good means of

Sergius de Witte, Minister of Finance.

Witte's industrial policy.

communication. She now undertook to supply this want by extensive railway building. For some years before M. de Witte assumed office, Russia was building less than 400 miles of railway a year; from that time on for the rest of the decade, she built nearly 1,400 miles a year. The most stupendous of these undertakings was that of a trunk line connecting Europe with the Pacific Ocean, the great Trans-Siberian railroad. For this Russia borrowed vast sums of money in western Europe, principally in France. Begun in 1891, the road was formally opened in 1902. It has reduced the time and cost of transportation to the East about one-half. In 1909 Russia possessed over 41,000 miles of railway, over 28,000 of which were owned and operated by the Government.

Extensive railway construction.

This tremendous change in the economic life of the Empire was destined to have momentous consequences, some of which were quickly apparent. With the introduction of modern industry on a large scale came the rise of a large laboring class and of labor problems of the kind with which western Europe had long been familiar. An industrial proletariat has sprung up in Russia as elsewhere, a new source of discontent. Cities have grown rapidly, owing to the large number of workmen pouring into them. Two of these, Moscow and St. Petersburg, have over a million each. In the large factory towns the revolutionists have a new field of activity which can be more easily worked than the country districts. Here socialistic theories have spread rapidly as among the working people of the other countries of Europe.

Rise of labor problems.

All this, too, has created a considerable body of rich "industrials" of the middle class, of capitalists, in short, a bourgeoisie which would not permanently be content with entire exclusion from political power or with obsolete, narrow, illiberal forms of government. Thus the political condition of to-day has been rendered more complex by the addition of two new elements to the army of discontent. Looked at in this light, the reign of Alexander III is seen

Rise of a rich bourgeoisie.

to be, not stagnant, but highly formative. Alexander was undermining his most cherished political principle by the new forces which he was liberating, and which in time were bound to spring the old iron framework of Russian life asunder. This fact partly explains the great unpopularity of Witte among the traditional ruling classes of Russia. A system resting on privilege and tradition cannot safely innovate even in the direction of extracting oil and iron from the soil, and spinning cotton and weaving wool. That the old system was being undermined was not, however, apparent, and might not have been for many years had not Russia, ten years after Alexander's death, become involved in a disastrous and humiliating war with Japan.

The system of privilege menaced.

THE REIGN OF NICHOLAS II

Accession of Nicholas II.

Alexander III died in 1894, and was succeeded by his son, Nicholas II, then twenty-six years of age. The hope was general that a milder régime might now be introduced. This, however, was not to be. No change of importance was made in the Emperor's councilors. Pobyedonostseff, the very incarnation of narrow-minded, stiff-necked despotism, remained the power behind the throne. For ten years the young Tsar pursued the policy of his father with scarcely a variation save in the direction of greater severity. Nicholas early announced his intention to "protect the principle of autocracy as firmly and unswervingly as did my late and never-to-be-forgotten father." A suggestion of one of the zemstvos that representative institutions might be granted was declared "a senseless dream," and the zemstvo was severely reprimanded. The government of Russia grew more oppressive, rather than less, as the century wore to its close. It was not a government of law but one of arbitrary power. Its main instruments were a numerous and corrupt bureaucracy or body of state officials who were not, in the slightest degree, responsible to the people, and a ruthless,

Continuance of autocratic government.

active police. This being the system, an eminent Russian scholar, Professor Vinogradoff, could say in England in 1902, "Nobody is secure against search, arrest, imprisonment and relegation to the remote parts of the Empire. From political supervision the solicitude of the authorities has spread to interferences with all kinds of private affairs. . . . Such is the legal protection we are now enjoying in Russia." And again, "Such a government is not a fitting patron of law and justice. What it enforces is obedience to order, not to law, and its contempt of law is exemplified in every way." [1] Under such a system, men could be terrorized into silence, they could not be made contented. Disaffection, driven into subterranean channels, only increased, biding its time for explosion. The immense additions to the public debt and expenditure, occasioned by the extensive railroad building and the support of army and navy, involved heavier taxation which fell mainly on the poor, the peasantry, reducing them to destitution and despair. Of this the same Russian authority said, speaking of the appalling conditions, "In most cases the number of cattle and horses owned by the peasantry is decreasing. In some districts of the province of Samara, which counts among the granaries of Russia, there have been years when one-third, and even one-half of the population have been turned into mendicants. When the tax gatherer turns away in despair from such wretched people he fastens the more on those who still have something left. It may be said without exaggeration that for the majority of the Russian peasantry the primary object in life is to earn enough to pay the taxes, everything else is accident. The wonder is not at the lack of enterprise and thrift, but at the endurance which enables men to toil along in the face of such conditions." [2] The same witness quotes a Russian magistrate as saying that "there is no indignity which, in the beginning

Increasing disaffection.

Wretched condition of the peasantry.

[1] Lectures on the History of the Nineteenth Century, edited by F. A. Kirkpatrick, 266-267.

[2] Ibid., 259.

of the twentieth century, may not be inflicted on a Russian peasant."

Persecution of the "intellectuals."

The professional and educated man was in a condition almost as intolerable. If a professor in a university, he was watched by the police, and was likely to be removed at any moment as was Professor Milyoukov, an historian of distinguished attainments, for no other reason than "generally noxious tendencies." If an editor, his position was even more precarious, unless he was utterly servile to the authorities. It was a suffocating atmosphere for any man of the slightest intellectual independence, living in the ideas of the present age. The censorship grew more and more rigorous, and included such books as Green's History of England, and Bryce's American Commonwealth. Arbitrary arrests of all kinds increased from year to year as the difficulty of thoroughly bottling up Russia increased. Students were the objects of special police care, as it was the young and ardent and educated who were most indignant at this senseless despotism. Many of them disappeared, in one year as many as a fifth of those in the University of Moscow, probably sent to Siberia or to prisons in Europe.

Attack upon the Finns.

A government of this kind was not likely to err from excess of sympathy with the subject nationalities, such as the Poles and the Finns. In Finland, indeed, its arbitrary course attained its climax. Finland had been acquired by Russia in 1809, but on liberal terms. It was not incorporated in Russia, but continued a Grand Duchy, with the Emperor of Russia as simply Grand Duke. It had its own Parliament, its Fundamental Laws or constitution, to which the Grand Duke swore fidelity. These Fundamental Laws could not be altered or explained or repealed except with the consent of the Diet and the Grand Duke. Finland was a constitutional state, governing itself, connected with Russia in the person of its sovereign. It had its own army, its own currency and postal system. Under this liberal régime it prospered greatly, its population increasing from less than

a million to nearly three million by the close of the century, and was, according to an historian of Russia, at least thirty years in advance of that country in all the appliances of material civilization.[1] The sight of this country enjoying a constitution of its own and a separate organization was an offense to the men controlling Russia. They wished to sweep away all distinctions between the various parts of the Emperor's dominions, to unify, to Russify. The attack upon the liberties of the Finns began under Alexander III. It was carried much further by Nicholas II, who, on February 15, 1899, issued an imperial manifesto which really abrogated the constitution of the country. The Finnish Diet was henceforth to legislate only concerning matters relating solely to Finland. All legislation of a general nature affecting the Empire as a whole was to be enacted in the ordinary way, that is, by the Tsar, who also said, "We have found it necessary to reserve to Ourselves the ultimate decision as to which laws come within the scope of the general legislation of the Empire." This practically meant that Finland was henceforth to be ruled like Russia. The Finns so understood it. The following Sunday was observed as a day of mourning. An immense petition was drawn up, signed within five days by over half a million people. The Tsar refused to receive it.

Abrogation of the Finnish constitution.

The process of enforced Russification was continued. The Finnish army was virtually incorporated in the Russian. Finnish soldiers, who had hitherto been required to serve only in the Grand Duchy, might now be sent to serve anywhere. Russian officials were appointed to positions in Finland previously filled only by Finns. Newspapers were suppressed or suspended. Finnish nationality was being intentionally crushed out. Intense was the indignation of the Finns, but three million people were powerless against the autocrat of one hundred and forty million. For the moment there were no signs of any possible relief. Grim

Despair of the Finns.

[1] Skrine, Expansion of Russia, 1815-1900, p. 322.

despair seized the people. Temporary relief was to come as a result of the disastrous defeat of Russia in the war with Japan in 1904-5, a landmark in contemporary history.

Rise of the Far Eastern Question.

To understand recent events in Russia it is necessary to trace the course of that war whose consequences have been profound and far-reaching, and to show the significance of that conflict we must interrupt this narrative of Russian history in order to give an account of the recent evolution of Asia, the rise of the so-called Far Eastern Question, and the interaction of Occident and Orient upon each other.

CHAPTER XXX

THE FAR EAST

ENGLAND, FRANCE, AND RUSSIA IN ASIA

England, France, and Russia in Asia.

Europe has not only taken possession of Africa, but she has taken possession of large parts of Asia, and presses with increasing force upon the remainder. England and France dominate southern Asia by their control, the former of India and Burma, the latter of a large part of Indo-China. Russia, on the other hand, dominates the north, from the Ural Mountains to the Pacific Ocean. As far as geographical extent is concerned, she is far more an Asiatic power than a European, which, indeed, is also true of England and of France, and she has been an Asiatic power much longer than they, for as early as 1581 Cossacks from the Don had crossed the Urals and seized a town called Sibir. Pushing onward farther and farther east, and meeting no serious obstacles, the population being small, they conquered most of northern Asia before the Pilgrims came to America, and in 1633 they reached the Pacific. To this country, now Russian, they gave the name Siberia, applying the name of the first region conquered to the whole. In 1648 the town of Okhotsk was founded. Thus for nearly three centuries Russia has been a great Asiatic state, while England has been a power in India for only half that time.

Russian expansion.

It was not until the nineteenth century, however, that Russia began to devote serious attention to Asia as a field for colonial and commercial expansion. Siberia was regarded merely as a convenient prison to which to send her disaffected or criminal citizens. Events in Europe have caused her to concentrate her attention more and more upon her Asiatic development. She has sought there what she had long been seeking in Europe, but without avail, because of the oppo-

sition she encountered, namely, contact with the ocean, free outlets to the world. Russia's coast line, either in Europe or Asia, had no harbors free from ice the year round. She had attempted to gain this contact at the expense of Turkey, hoping to reach the Mediterranean, but she had not succeeded. She made no progress in this direction in the nineteenth century. Blocked decisively by the Crimean war, and seeing no chance in Europe, she turned to seek advantage in the East. Her coast line in eastern Siberia was very far north, with the result that its harbors were icebound more than half of the year. She sought to extend that line southward. In 1858 she acquired from China, then involved in a war with Great Britain and France, the whole northern bank of the Amur, and two years later she acquired from China more territory farther south, which became the Maritime Province, and at the southern point of this she founded as a naval base Vladivostok, which means the Dominator of the East. Here her development in eastern Asia stopped.

Russia seeks access to the sea.

Conquest of Turkestan.

In another direction, Russian advance has been notable. She has conquered Turkestan, a vast region east of the Caspian Sea, and this conquest has brought her close to India, and has given great importance to Afghanistan as a buffer between them. Turkestan had a population of about 10,000,000, partly nomadic, partly settled in famous cities such as Samarkand, Bokhara, Tashkend. The nomads frequently made incursions into Siberia, and cut off the communications of Russia with her eastern possessions. To secure the safety of Siberia it was necessary to subdue them. The process was a long one (1845-1885), and at time exceedingly difficult, but was in the end entirely successful, and Russia annexed Turkestan, proceeding shortly to connect it with Europe by the Trans-Caspian railroad.

CHINA

China.

Between Russian Asia on the north, and British and French Asia on the south, lies the oldest empire of the

world, China, and one more extensive than Europe and probably more populous, with more than 400,000,000 inhabitants.[1] It is a land of great navigable rivers, of vast agricultural areas, and of mines rich in coal and metals, as yet largely undeveloped. The Chinese were a highly civilized people long before the Europeans were. They preceded the latter by centuries in the use of the compass, powder, porcelain, paper. As early as the sixth century of our era they knew the art of printing from movable wooden blocks. They have long been famous for their work in bronze, in wood, in lacquer, for the marvels of their silk manufacture. As a people laborious and intelligent, they have always been devoted to the peaceful pursuits of industry, and have despised the arts of war. Their greatest national hero is not a soldier but a philosopher and moralist, Confucius. Their really vital religion is ancestor worship, and they worship, not simply the souls of their ancestors, but their ideas and customs as well. Hence the most salient feature of their civilization, its immobility. For that civilization, so ancient, and in some respects so brilliant, lacked the very element that gives to European civilization its extraordinary interest, namely, its restlessness, its eagerness, its buoyancy, its daring, its constant struggle for improvement, its adaptability to the new, its forwardness of view, in short, its belief in progress. The one emphasized the past, the other the present and the future. The history of the former was one of endless repetition from generation to generation, and from century to century; the history of the latter was one of evolution. The reverence for ancestral ideas, for immemorial customs as the perfection of wisdom, rendered the Chinese hostile to all innovations in the realm of thought or in the realm of action. Foreigners they regarded as barbarians.

The civilization of China.

[1] Mr. W. W. Rockhill, late minister of the United States at Peking, came to the conclusion in 1904, after careful inquiries, that the official Chinese estimates have been for a hundred and fifty years greatly exaggerated and that the number of inhabitants does not much exceed 270,000,000.

Their Kingdom they called the Middle Kingdom, i.e., the center of the world. They called themselves Celestials.

The government of China.

Their Emperor was the "Son of Heaven." He was, in theory, an absolute monarch. He was represented in the eighteen provinces into which China was divided by Viceroys. The office-holding class, called by foreigners the *mandarins*, was chosen from the educated by an elaborate and severe series of examinations in the literature and learning of China. The programme of studies in vogue until very recently was the same that had been in vogue for a thousand years. The reigning dynasty, the Manchu, had been on the throne since 1644, when it succeeded in overthrowing the former or Ming dynasty.

Isolation of China.

China, then, had always lived a life of isolation, despising the outside world. Something was known of it in Europe, yet remarkably little. Marco Polo in the thirteenth century brought home marvelous accounts which were one of the great inspirations of the age of geographical discovery. Explorers and, later, missionaries and merchants sought out the fabulous land. At times they even received some favors from the more enlightened Emperors. But, speaking broadly, the connection between Europe and China was of the slightest down to the nineteenth century. Foreigners were permitted in the eighteenth century to trade in one Chinese port, Canton, but even there only under vexatious and humiliating conditions. China had no diplomatic representatives in any foreign country, nor were any foreign ambassadors resident in Peking. China did not recognize any equality on the part of England, France, Spain, or any other country. "There is only one sun in the heavens, and there is only one Emperor on earth," was a Chinese saying. Inhabiting a country larger than Europe, with every variety of soil and climate, and with an old and elaborate civilization, it is not surprising that the Chinese were self-sufficient and indifferent to the outside world. They even forbade foreigners learning the Chinese language.

Obviously a policy of such isolation could not be permanently maintained in the modern age, and as the nineteenth century progressed it was gradually shattered. This isolation began to be broken down by the outside world as a result of the so-called Opium War between China and Great Britain. Opium, a very harmful and dangerous drug, is made from a certain kind of poppy that is grown in India. The Chinese government, anxious to preserve its people from the effects of the usage of this drug, forbade its importation in 1796. Yet the trade, though declared illegal, was carried on by smugglers with whom corrupt Chinese officials connived for the sake of gain. This illicit traffic flourished greatly. Four thousand chests were imported into China in 1796, thirty thousand in 1837. Each chest was supposed to be worth from six to twelve hundred dollars. The profits were enormous. The trade was a source of great income to British India, which did not wish to do without it.

The Opium War.

In 1837 the Chinese government proposed to stop this smuggling, and sent a Viceroy of great energy, Lin, to see that it was done. In this it was entirely within its rights. Lin seized about 20,000 chests of opium and destroyed them. Unfortunately, by his later arbitrary and arrogant proceedings, he put himself in the wrong. Out of this situation arose the Opium War, which began in 1840, and lasted about two years, ending in the victory of Great Britain. This was the first war between China and a European power. The consequences, in forcing the doors of China wider open to European influence, were important. By the Treaty of Nanking, 1842, she was forced to pay a large war indemnity, in part as compensation for the destroyed opium; to open to British trade four ports in addition to Canton, namely, Amoy, Foochow, Ningpo, and Shanghai, on the same conditions as those established for Canton; and to cede the island of Hong Kong, near Canton, to England outright. Hong Kong has since become one of the most important naval and

The treaty ports.

commercial stations of the British Empire. A step was taken also toward the recognition of the equality of Great Britain with China. It was provided that henceforth British officials should be treated as the equals of Chinese officials of similar rank. The question of the opium trade was left undecided. The Chinese refused to legalize it, declining, as they said, "to put a value upon riches and to slight men's lives." They were, however, afraid after their defeat to enforce their prohibition of it, and the smuggling began again and flourished more than ever. Owing to the fact that, practically, the Chinese were not permitted by a Christian nation to abolish an infamous traffic because it was a very lucrative one, and owing to the humiliation of their defeat, the relations with Great Britain continued unstable, and even led to another war.

Entrance of various powers into commercial relations.

Other powers now proceeded to take advantage of the British success. The United States sent Caleb Cushing to make a commercial treaty with China in 1844, and before long France, Belgium, Holland, Prussia, and Portugal established trade centers at the five treaty ports. Some years later trouble arose in Canton between the English and the Chinese which led to a second war with China. England was joined by France this time, the reason for French intervention being the murder of a French missionary, an act for which no reparation could be secured. The allies resolved to carry the war to the very neighborhood of Peking, the capital. The Chinese Emperor, therefore, in 1858, agreed to the double Treaties of Tientsin. By the one with England, China agreed henceforth to receive a British ambassador, also to open more ports to commerce and to receive British consuls at the treaty ports. The treaty with France was of much the same nature, though differing in details. These treaties represented a great step forward in the recognition of the equality of European powers with China, and in furthering commercial intercourse. But, the Chinese not carrying them out, hostilities were renewed. The allies again marched upon

Treaties of Tientsin.

Peking, burned the Emperor's beautiful summer palace just outside, and prepared to bombard the city. The result was that China confirmed the Treaties of Tientsin and agreed to pay additional war indemnities (1860). Thus she was brought into more direct connection with the outside world.

Russia annexes the Maritime Province.

Russia, which had taken no part in these proceedings, knew how to profit by them. It was at this time that she induced China to cede to her the Maritime Province, which extended her Pacific coast line seven hundred miles further south, enabling her to found at its southern port Vladivostok, as has already been mentioned (1860).

The period of greatest importance in China's relations with Europe came in the last decade of the nineteenth century as a result of a war with Japan in 1894-5. To appreciate this war it is first necessary to give some account of the previous evolution of Japan.

JAPAN

Japan.

The rise of Japan as the most forceful state in the Orient is a chapter of very recent history, of absorbing interest, and of great significance to the present age. Accomplished in the last third of the nineteenth century, it has already profoundly altered the conditions of international politics, and seems likely to be a factor of increasing moment in the future evolution of the world.

Description of Japan.

Japan is an archipelago consisting of several large islands and about four thousand smaller ones. It covers an area of 147,000 square miles,[1] which is smaller than that of California. The main islands form a crescent, the northern point being opposite Siberia, the southern turning in toward Korea. Between it and Asia is the Sea of Japan. The country is very mountainous, its most famous peak, Fujiyama rising to a height of 12,000 feet. Of volcanic origin, numerous craters are still active. Earthquakes are not un-

[1] Exclusive of territories acquired since 1894.

common, and have determined the character of domestic architecture. The coast line is much indented, and there are many good harbors. The Japanese call their country Nippon, or the Land of the Rising Sun. Only about one-sixth of the land is under cultivation, owing to its mountainous character, and owing to the prevalent mode of farming. Yet into this small area is crowded a population of about fifty million, which is larger than that of Great Britain or France. It is no occasion for surprise that the Japanese have desired territorial expansion.

Japanese civilization.

The people of Japan derived the beginnings of their civilization from China, but in many respects they differed greatly from the Chinese. The virtues of the soldier were held in high esteem. Patriotism was a passion, and with it went the spirit of unquestioning self-sacrifice. "Thou shalt honor the gods and love thy country," was a command of the Shinto religion, and was universally obeyed. An art-loving and pleasure-loving people, they possessed active minds and a surprising power of assimilation which they were to show on a national and momentous scale.

The Mikado.

In the middle of the nineteenth century their state and society were thoroughly feudal, and presented many interesting points of similarity with forms long outlived in Europe. The Mikado or Emperor, reputed to be the descendant of the gods, was the head of the nation. But while he had formerly been a powerful personage he had for two centuries and more sunk into a purely passive state. He lived in complete seclusion in his palace in Kioto, took no part in the actual government, had become, in fact, a figurehead, invested with a kind of religious authority or halo, so that many foreigners thought that he was not the Emperor but a sacred ecclesiastical personage. The real

The Shogun.

authority was the Shogun. The comparison is often made between the Shogun and the Frankish mayor of the palace in Merovingian times. Reigning as a mere servant of the Mikado, he had known how to acquire from the latter more

and more power in the actual direction of affairs until he was practically the ruler. He had his own palace at Yedo, which was the real seat of government, and his power became hereditary, passing from the Shogun to his heir without disturbance. The Mikado was the nominal, the Shogun the real ruler. There were thus practically two dynasties. Beneath the Shogun was the military aristocracy, the Daimios, owners of great estates, governors of provinces, and beneath them their retainers, the Samurai, or class of warriors, completely armed in coats of mail, helmets, and cuirasses, not greatly dissimilar from those with which Europe had been familiar centuries before. These were the directing classes of the state. Beneath them were the masses of the people, of no importance politically, merchants, peasants, artisans. Such was the system that remained intact until the remarkable revolution which began in 1868. That revolution was a direct result of the insistence of foreign nations that Japan should enter with them into the ordinary relations that exist among nations.

The Daimios, the Samurai.

For about two hundred years Japan had been almost hermetically sealed against the outside world. In the period of geographical discoveries of the fifteenth century, Zipangu had been one of the mysteries and allurements of the venturesome navigators. Europe had a vague knowledge of the existence of this island, which was placed on pre-Columbian maps somewhat east of the present United States. To clear up this obscurity, and to find a convenient route to the riches which were associated in men's minds with the East generally, was one of the objects of the Spanish and Portuguese discoverers. One of the latter, Pinto, was the first to reach the famous land, in 1542. He was well received, as were for a time other visitors. In a few years missionaries came, among whom was Francis Xavier, the Jesuit. Later other missionaries appear to have had very considerable success. It is said that in 1581 there were two hundred churches and 50,000 converts, and for some years before 1590 it is esti-

Advent of Europeans.

mated that there were 10,000 converts a year. But bitter persecutions of the Christians finally broke out, apparently occasioned by the pretensions and tactlessness of the bishops, and possibly by their political intriguing. A reaction naturally resulted. More than 20,000 converts were put to death in 1591, amid fearful tortures. The spirit of persecution flamed up from time to time in the years following, costing thousands of victims. The anti-foreign feeling grew so strong that in 1638 Japan adopted a policy of isolation, more rigorous than that of China. Foreigners were forbidden to enter the country under pain of death, and the Japanese were forbidden to leave it. They were also forbidden to buy foreign goods, and they might sell only those articles which the Government permitted, and then only to the Dutch, who were allowed a trading station on the small peninsula of Deshima. This was Japan's sole point of contact with the outside world for over two centuries.

Japan adopts a policy of isolation.

Commodore Perry.

This unnatural seclusion was rudely disturbed by the arrival in Japanese waters of an American fleet under Commodore Perry in 1853, sent out by the government of the United States. American sailors, engaged in the whale fisheries in the Pacific, were now and then wrecked on the coasts of Japan, where they generally received cruel treatment. Perry was instructed to demand of the ruler of Japan protection for American sailors and property thus wrecked, and permission for American ships to put into one or more Japanese ports, in order to obtain necessary supplies and to dispose of their cargoes. He presented these demands to the Shogun, supposing him to be the sovereign. He announced further that if his requests were refused, he would open hostilities. The Shogun granted certain immediate demands, but insisted that the general question of opening relations with a foreign state required careful consideration. Perry consented to allow this discussion and sailed away, stating that he would return the following year for the final answer. The discussion of the general question on the part of the

Shogun and the Daimios, or ruling military class, was very earnest. Some of the latter believed in maintaining the old policy of complete exclusion of foreigners. Others, however, including the Shogun, believed this impossible, owing to the manifest military superiority of the foreigners. They thought it well to enter into relations with them in order to learn the secret of that superiority, and then to appropriate it for Japan. They believed this the only way to insure, in the long run, the independence and power of their country. This opinion finally prevailed, and when Perry reappeared the Shogun made a treaty with him (1854) by which two ports were opened to American ships. This was a mere beginning, but the important fact was that Japan had, after two centuries of seclusion, entered into relations with a foreign state. Later other and more liberal treaties were concluded with the United States and with other countries.

Policy of isolation breaks down.

The reaction of these events upon the internal evolution of Japan was remarkable. They produced a very critical situation, and precipitated a civil war. The epoch-making treaty had been made by the Shogun, and one of its results was the speedy overthrow of the Shogunate and of the entire feudal system. The Mikado and his supporters resented the high-handed action of the Shogun, nominally a mere subordinate, who, in a matter of supreme importance, had not consulted the sovereign. All those members of the feudal nobility who opposed the admission of the foreigners sided with the Mikado in opposition to the Shogun. The Shogun and his supporters stood for the policy of entering into relations with the outside powers for the simple reason that the latter had the military force to enable them to impose their demands. The supporters of the Mikado were themselves now convinced of that superiority in a decisive manner. The popular hatred of foreigners resulted in outrages, several of them by the Mikado's partisans. One of these was upon an Englishman, Richardson, murdered in 1862. The English forthwith bombarded Kagoshima, the

Overthrow of the Shogunate.

stronghold of the anti-foreign Daimios (1863). This had the result of convincing these Daimios of the superiority of other nations to Japan, of the uselessness of combating them or trying to keep them out of Japan, of the desirability of adopting their civilization in order to make Japan equally powerful. Thus they completely reversed their position, and became friends of the new foreign policy, instead of its bitter opponents. Other Daimios hostile to the foreigners were taught a similar lesson at Shimonoseki (1864). The situation remained, however, confused and troubled.

The Mikado recovers power.

In 1866 the Shogun died, and 1867 the Mikado. The successor to the latter was Mutsuhito, the present Emperor, then fifteen years of age. A civil war shortly broke out between the representatives of the Mikado and the supporters of the Shogun. The latter were repeatedly defeated. The Shogunate was abolished. Henceforth the Mikado was the real as well as the nominal head of the state. He abandoned the retirement in which his predecessors had lived so long, left Kioto in order to emphasize this fact, and established himself in Yedo, previously the Shogun's capital, to which was now given the name Tokio, the Capital of the East (1868).

Rapid transformation of Japan.

The collapse of the Shogunate, and the restoration of the Mikado to absolute power constituted the initial step of a remarkable and sweeping transformation of Japan, the beginning of a new era, which the Mikado himself called the era of "enlightened rule." Japan revolutionized her political and social institutions in a few years, adopted with ardor the material and scientific civilization of the West, made herself in these respects a European state, and entered as a result upon an international career, which has already profoundly modified the world, and is likely to be a constant and an increasing factor in the future development of the East. So complete, so rapid, so hearty an appropriation of an alien civilization, a civilization against which every precaution of exclusion had for centuries been taken, is a

change unique in the history of the world, and notable for the audacity and the intelligence displayed. The entrance upon this course was a direct result of Perry's expedition. The Japanese revolution will always remain an astounding story. Once begun with the abolition of the Shogunate, it proceeded with great rapidity. In 1871 the Daimios or nobles, most of whom had sided with the Mikado, voluntarily relinquished their feudal rights, and the feudal system, which had lasted for over eight hundred years, was entirely abolished. The old warrior class of Samurai, numbering about four hundred thousand, gave up their class privileges, and became ordinary citizens. All this cleared the way for a general adoption of European institutions. In place of the former military class arose an army based on European models. Military service was declared universal and obligatory in 1872. The German system, which has revolutionized Europe, began to revolutionize Asia. Soldiers enter upon military service at the age of twenty, serve three years in the active army, pass for four into the reserve, and are liable to be called out in any time of crisis until the age of forty. The army was thus made national. European officers were imported to train it. A navy was started, and dockyards and arsenals were constructed.

Abolition of the old régime.

Adoption of European institutions.

The first railroad was begun in 1870 between Tokio and Yokohama. Thirty years later there were over 3,600 miles in operation. To-day there are 5,000. Steam navigation was begun, a telegraph system commenced in 1868, a postal system instituted, and in 1878 a Stock Exchange and a Chamber of Commerce were opened at Tokio. The educational methods of the West were also introduced. A university was established at Tokio, and later another at Kioto. Professors from abroad were induced to accept important positions in them. Students showed great enthusiasm in pursuing the new learning. Public schools were created rapidly, and by 1883 about 3,300,000 pupils were receiving educa-

Reform in education.

tion. In 1884 the study of English was introduced into them. Compulsory military service and the system of education tended to fuse the people into a homogeneous whole, permeated with the same spirit of progress, optimism, and patriotism. Newspapers, first permitted in 1869, multiplied rapidly, until in 1882 there were over a hundred. Translations of foreign books were published unceasingly. Vaccination was introduced, and in 1873 the European calendar was adopted. The codes of law, civil and criminal, and the code of judicial procedure were thoroughly remodeled after an exhaustive study of European systems. The equality of all citizens before the law was proclaimed, and to crown this work of peaceful revolution a constitution was granted by the Mikado. The Mikado had promised this in 1881, and had declared that in 1890 Japan should have a parliament. He was true to his word. In 1881 a commission, at whose head was Count Ito, went to Europe to study the political systems in operation there. After its return the information gathered was carefully studied by a special body appointed for the purpose. This body drafted a constitution in which the influence of England, the United States, Germany, and other countries can easily be traced. Eight years were spent upon the elaboration of this document, which was proclaimed in 1889. It established a parliament of two chambers, a House of Peers, and a House of Representatives. The vote for the latter body was given to men of twenty-five years of age who paid direct taxes to the state of about seven dollars and a half. This was reduced in 1900 to those paying about five dollars. The members of the popular house receive salaries. The constitution reserves very large powers for the monarch. Parliament met for the first time in 1890.

Japan becomes a constitutional state.

Thus Japan, as soon as she recognized the superiority of foreign nations, reversed her long-established policy of seclusion, and, instead of lying helpless before them, studied them carefully, adopted all of the machinery of their civiliza-

tion, political, military, industrial, intellectual, that seemed to promise advantage, and in a few years emerged completely revolutionized and immensely strengthened. Not that such far-reaching reforms occasioned no dissatisfaction, for they did—and even a rebellion—which was easily put down. The test of rejuvenated Japan came in the last decade of the nineteenth century and the first of the twentieth, and proved the solidity of this amazing achievement. During those years she fought and defeated two powers apparently much stronger than herself, China and Russia, and took her place as an equal in the family of nations.

Wars with China and Russia.

CHINO-JAPANESE WAR AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

Cause of the war with China.

A war in which the efficiency of the transformed Japan was clearly established broke out with China in 1894. The immediate cause was the relations of the two powers to Korea, a peninsula lying between China and Japan, about six hundred miles long, with an area one-fifth less than that of Great Britain, and a population of ten or twelve million. This territory was a kingdom, but both China and Japan claimed suzerainty over it. Japan had an interest in extending her claims, as she desired larger markets for her products. Friction was frequent between the two countries concerning their rights in Korea, as a consequence of which Japan began a war in which, with her modern army, she was easily victorious over her giant neighbor, whose armies fought in the old Asiatic style with a traditional Asiatic equipment. The Japanese drove the Chinese out of Korea, defeated their navy in the battle of the Yalu, invaded Manchuria, where they seized the fortress of Port Arthur, the strongest position in eastern Asia, occupied the Liao-tung peninsula on which that fortress is located, and prepared to advance toward Peking. The Chinese, alarmed for their capital, agreed to make peace, and signed the treaty of Shimonoseki (April 17, 1895),

Treaty of Shimonoseki

by which they ceded Port Arthur, the Liao-tung peninsula, the island of Formosa, and the Pescadores Islands to Japan, also agreeing to pay a large war indemnity of two hundred million taels (about $175,000,000). China recognized the complete independence of Korea.

But in the hour of her triumph Japan was thwarted by a European intervention, and deprived of the fruits of her victory. Russia now entered in decisive fashion upon a scene where she was to play a prominent part for the next ten years. The advance of Russia in eastern Asia had early aroused the apprehension of the Japanese. The building of the Trans-Siberian railroad, begun in 1891, seemed to them to indicate that Russia was cherishing ulterior ambitions. The Japanese felt that a further increase of Russian power in Asia would be a menace to themselves. Their anxiety proved well founded. Russia showed that she entertained plans directly opposed to those of the Japanese.

Intervention of Russia, France, and Germany.

She induced France and Germany to join her in forcing them to give up the most important rewards of their victory, to which the conquered Chinese had consented in the treaty. These powers were determined that Japan should not have Port Arthur, should not have any foothold on the continent of Asia. They therefore demanded, "in the cause of peace and amity," that the treaty be revised. The reason given by the Russian Government to the Japanese Government was that "the possession of the peninsula of Liao-tung, claimed by Japan, would be a constant menace to the capital of China, would, at the same time, render illusory the independence of Korea, and would henceforth be a perpetual obstacle to the permanent peace of the Far East," and the Tsar advised the Mikado "to renounce the definite possession of the peninsula of Liao-tung." This was a bitter blow to the Japanese. Recognizing, however, that it would be folly to oppose the three great military powers of Europe, they yielded to the "advice," restored Port Arthur and the peninsula to China, and withdrew from the mainland, indignant at the action

Japan relinquishes Port Arthur.

JAPANESE INFANTRY ATTACKING A CHINESE POSITION.

of the powers, and resolved to increase their army and navy and develop their resources, believing that their enemy in Asia was Russia, with whom a day of reckoning must come sooner or later, and confirmed in this belief by events that crowded thick and fast in the next few years.

The insincerity of the powers in talking about the integrity of China and the peace of the East was not long in manifesting itself. The intervening powers immediately set about reaping their reward. Russia secured the right to run the eastern end of the Trans-Siberian railroad across Manchuria, a province of China, to Vladivostok, and to construct a branch line south from Harbin into the Liaotung peninsula, with a terminus at Talienwan. At the end of a certain time, and under certain conditions this railroad was to pass into the possession of China, but meanwhile Russia was given the right to send her own soldiers into Manchuria to guard it. This was the beginning of Russian control of Manchuria. She poured tens of thousands of troops into that Chinese province, and gradually acted as if it were Russian. She also acquired extensive mineral and timber rights in the province.

Russian Entrance into Manchuria.

In 1897 two German missionaries were murdered in the province of Shantung. The German Emperor immediately sent a fleet to demand redress. As a result Germany secured (March 5, 1898) from China a ninety-nine year lease of the fine harbor of Kiauchau, with a considerable area round about, and extensive commercial and financial privileges in the whole province of Shantung. Indeed, that province became a German "sphere of influence."

German aggression.

This action encouraged Russia to make further demands. She acquired from China (March 27, 1898) a lease for twenty-five years of Port Arthur, the strongest position in eastern Asia, which, as she had stated to Japan in 1895, enabled the possessor to threaten Peking and to disturb the peace of the Orient. France and England also each acquired a port on similar terms of lease. The powers also forced

Russia secures Port Arthur.

China to open a dozen new ports to the trade of the world, and extensive rights to establish factories and build railways and develop mines.

It seemed, in the summer of 1898, that China was about to undergo the fate of Africa, that it was to be carved up among the various powers. This movement was checked by the rise of a bitterly anti-foreign party, occasioned by these act of aggression, and culminating in the Boxer insurrections of 1900. The "Boxers" were one of the numerous secret societies which abound in China. They were vehemently opposed to foreigners and to the foreign ideas which their own Emperor, after the defeat at the hands of the Japanese, wished to adopt. They enjoyed the support of the Empress-Dowager, aunt of the Emperor, a woman of remarkable force, who had been for many years the real ruler of China during the minority of the latter. She now emerged from her retirement, and by a coup d'état pushed the Emperor aside, stopping abruptly the liberal reforms which he was inaugurating. The Government, for she was henceforth the leading power in the state, was in sympathy and probably in direct connivance with the Boxers. This movement grew rapidly, and spread over northern China. Its aim was to drive the "foreign devils into the sea." Scores of missionaries and their families were killed, and hundreds of Chinese converts murdered in cold blood. Finally, the Legations of the various powers in Peking were besieged, and for weeks Europe and America feared that all the foreigners there would be massacred. In the presence of this common danger the powers were obliged to drop their jealousies and rivalries, and send a relief expedition, consisting of troops from Japan, Russia, Germany, France, Great Britain, and the United States. The Legations were rescued, just as their resources were exhausted by the siege of two months (June 13-August 14, 1900). The international army suppressed the Boxer movement after a short campaign, forced the Chinese to pay a large indemnity, and to punish the ringleaders. In forming

The "Boxer" movement.

Rescue of the Legations.

this international army, the powers had agreed not to acquire territory, and at the close of the war they guaranteed the integrity of China. Whether this would mean anything remained to be seen.

Japan indignant and apprehensive.

The integrity of China had been invoked in 1895 and ignored in the years following. Russia, France, and Germany had appealed to it as a reason for demanding the evacuation of Port Arthur by the Japanese in 1895. Soon afterward Germany had virtually annexed a port and a province of China, and France had also acquired a port in the south. Then came the most decisive act, the securing of Port Arthur by Russia. This caused a wave of indignation to sweep over Japan, and the people of that country were with difficulty kept in check by the prudence of their statesmen. The acquisition of Port Arthur by Russia meant that now she had a harbor ice-free the year round. That Russia did not look upon her possession as merely a short lease, but as a permanent one, was unmistakably shown by her conduct. She constructed a railroad south from Harbin, connecting with the Trans-Siberian. She threw thousands of troops into Manchuria; she set about immensely strengthening Port Arthur as a fortress, and a considerable fleet was stationed there. To the Japanese all this seemed to prove that she purposed ultimately to annex the immense province of Manchuria, and later probably Korea, which would give her a large number of ice-free harbors and place her in a dominant position on the Pacific, menacing, the Japanese felt, the very existence of Japan. Moreover, this would absolutely cut off all chance of possible Japanese expansion in these directions, and of the acquisition of their markets for Japanese industries. The ambitions of the two powers to dominate the East clashed, and, in addition, to Japan the matter seemed to involve her permanent safety, even in her island empire.

Russian activity in Manchuria.

Meanwhile, the other powers, observing the increasing Russian control of Manchuria, repeatedly asked that power

Diplomatic negotiations concerning Manchuria.

her intentions. Russian annexation of Manchuria would probably mean the closing of that province to the commerce of the rest of the world. The powers were, therefore, insistent, particularly the United States and England, in urging the policy of the "open door." Russia gave the powers the formal promise to withdraw from Manchuria "as soon as lasting order shall have been established" there, but she steadily refused to specify the date, and this became, therefore, one of the subjects of diplomatic negotiation.

The Anglo-Japanese Treaty of 1902.

Japan's prestige at this time was greatly increased by a treaty concluded with England in 1902, establishing a defensive alliance according to which the two powers "actuated solely by a desire to maintain the status quo and general peace in the extreme East, being, moreover, especially interested in maintaining the territorial integrity of the Empire of China and the Empire of Korea, and in securing equal opportunities in those countries for the commerce and industry of all nations," agreed, among other things, to remain strictly neutral in case either power became involved in a war concerning these matters, but also agreed that if a third power should join the enemy against the ally, then the second power would drop its neutrality and come to the assistance of its ally, making war and peace in common with it. This meant that if France or Germany should aid Russia in a war with Japan, then England would aid Japan. In a war between Russia and Japan alone England would be neutral. This treaty was, therefore, of great practical importance to Japan, and it also increased her prestige. For the first time in history, an Asiatic power had entered into an alliance with a European power on a plane of entire equality. Japan had entered the family of nations, and it was remarkable evidence of her importance that Great Britain saw advantage in an alliance with her.

Russia, with the other powers, had recognized the integrity of China. Her position differed from theirs in that she had a large army in Manchuria, a Chinese province, and

a leasehold of the strong fortress and naval base of Port Arthur. She had definitely promised to withdraw from Manchuria when order should be restored, but she declined to make the statement more explicit. Her military preparations increasing all the while, the Japanese demanded of her the date at which she intended to withdraw her troops from Manchuria, order having apparently been restored. Negotiations between the two powers dragged on from August 1903 to February 1904. Japan, believing that Russia was merely trying to gain time to tighten her grip on Manchuria by elaborate and intentional delay and evasion, and to prolong the discussion until she had sufficient troops in the province to be able to throw aside the mask, suddenly broke off diplomatic relations and commenced hostilities. On the night of the 8th-9th of February, 1904, the Japanese torpedoed a part of the Russian fleet before Port Arthur and threw their armies into Korea.

Japan makes war upon Russia.

The Russo-Japanese war, thus begun, lasted from February 1904 to September 1905. It was fought on both land and sea. Russia had two fleets in Asiatic waters, one at Port Arthur and one at Vladivostok. Her land connection with eastern Asia was by the long single track of the Trans-Siberian railway. Japan succeeded in bottling the Port Arthur fleet at the very outset of the war. Controlling the Asiatic waters she was able to transport armies and munitions to the scene of the land warfare with only slight losses at the hands of the Vladivostok fleet. One army drove the Russians out of Korea, back from the Yalu. Another under General Oku landed on the Liao-tung peninsula and cut off the connections of Port Arthur with Russia. It attempted to take Port Arthur by assault, but was unable to carry it, and finally began a siege. This siege was conducted by General Nogi, General Oku being engaged in driving the Russians back upon Mukden. The Russian General Kuropatkin marched south from Mukden to relieve Port Arthur. South of Mukden great battles occurred,

Russo-Japanese war, 1904-1905.

Siege of Port Arthur.

that of Liao-yang, engaging probably half a million men and lasting several days, resulted in a victory of the Japanese, who entered Liao-yang September 4, 1904. Their objective now was Mukden. Meanwhile, in August, the Japanese had defeated disastrously both the Port Arthur and Vladivostok fleets, eliminating them from the war. The terrific bombardment of Port Arthur continued until that fortress surrendered after a siege of ten months, costing the Japanese 60,000 in killed and wounded (January 1, 1905). The army which had conducted this siege was now able to march northward to co-operate with General Oku around Mukden. There several battles were fought, the greatest since the Franco-German war of 1870, lasting in each case several days. The last, at Mukden (March 6-10, 1905), cost both armies 120,000 men killed and wounded in four days' fighting. The Russians were defeated and evacuated Mukden, leaving 40,000 prisoners in the hands of the Japanese.

Mukden captured by the Japanese.

Destruction of the Russian fleet, May 27, 1905.

Another incident of the war was the sending out from Russia of a new fleet under Admiral Rodjestvensky, which, after a long voyage, was attacked at its close by Admiral Togo as it entered the Sea of Japan and annihilated in the great naval battle of the Straits of Tsushima, May 27, 1905.

The two powers finally consented, at the suggestion of President Roosevelt, to send delegates to Portsmouth, New Hampshire, to see if the war could be brought to a close. The result was the signing of the Treaty of Portsmouth, September 5, 1905. The war between Japan and Russia had been fought in lands belonging to neither power, in Korea, and principally in Manchuria, a province of China, yet Korea and China took no part in the war, were passive spectators, powerless to preserve the neutrality of their soil or their independent sovereignty.

The Treaty of Portsmouth.

By the Treaty of Portsmouth Russia recognized Japan's paramount interests in Korea, which country, however, was to remain independent. Both the Russians and the Japanese

ASIA
0 625 1250
Miles
Railroads
Russian
French
Dutch
German
English
Portuguese
Turkish Emp
United States
ATLANTIC OCEAN
PACIFIC OCEAN
INDIAN OCEAN
ARCTIC OCEAN
BERING SEA
Sea of Okhotsk
Japan Sea
Yellow Sea
East China Sea
South China Sea
Arabian Sea
Bay of Bengal
Black Sea
Caspian Sea
Aral Sea
Red Sea
Mediterranean Sea
Persian Gulf
Gulf of Aden
Gulf of Siam
Java Sea
Celebes Sea
Banda Sea
Timor Sea
Arafura Sea
Coral Sea
Tasman Sea
Kara Sea
Barents Sea
White Sea
North Sea
Baltic Sea
Irish Sea
Bay of Biscay
Gulf of Guinea
Gulf of Carpentaria
Great Australian Bight
Equator
Arctic Circle
Tropic of Cancer
Tropic of Capricorn
Longitude East
Greenwich
Russian Empire
Siberia
Mongolia
China
Tibet
Manchuria
Japan
Persia
Arabia
India
Burma
Siam
Indo China
Malaya
Sumatra
Java
Borneo
Celebes
Philippines
New Guinea
Australia
Europe
Asia
Africa
Russian-Japanese War 1904-05
RR in Operation
RR in Construction
Sea of Japan
Yellow Sea

were to evacuate Manchuria. Russia transferred to Japan her lease of Port Arthur and the Liao-tung peninsula, and ceded the southern half of the island of Saghalin.

Japan thus stood forth the dominant power of the Orient. She had expanded in ten years by the annexation of Formosa and Saghalin. She has not regarded Korea as independent, but since the close of the war has virtually, though not nominally, annexed her.[1] She possesses Port Arthur, and her position in Manchuria is one giving rise at the present moment to diplomatic discussion. She has an army of 600,000 men, equipped with all the most modern appliances of destruction, a navy about the size of that of France, flourishing industries, and flourishing commerce. The drain upon her resources during the past ten years has been tremendous, and, appreciating the need of many years of quiet recuperation and upbuilding, she was willing to make the Peace of Portsmouth. Her financial difficulties are great, imposing an abnormally heavy taxation. No people has accomplished so vast a transformation in so short a time.

The Russo-Japanese war cannot be said to have settled the Far Eastern Question, as the future of China is called. Wars may yet grow out of it. But if they do, it seems likely that a new factor will have to be considered, a rejuvenated and modern China. For the lesson of these events has not been lost upon the Chinese. The victories of Japan, an Oriental state, over a great Occidental power, as well as over China, has convinced many influential Chinese of the advantage to be derived from an adoption of European methods, an appropriation of European knowledge. Moreover, they see that the only way to repel the aggres-

Reaction of these events upon China.

[1] By an agreement signed by Korea and Japan, November 17, 1905, the control of the foreign relations of Korea was placed in the hands of the Japanese Government. It was also provided that a Japanese Resident-General should be stationed in Seoul. By a subsequent agreement, signed by the same parties, July 31, 1907, all administrative measures and all high official appointments are subject to the approval of the Resident-General. Japanese subjects are eligible to official positions in Korea.

sions of outside powers is to be equipped with the weapons used by the aggressor.

This change of attitude was represented after the Boxer rebellion by the Empress-Dowager herself, upon whom the invasion of her capital by the international army in 1900 and the punishment inflicted upon the country were not lost. Returning to Peking she showed herself more accessible to foreigners and foreign ideas, and after 1900 she began to approve of reforms more far-reaching than those for which in 1898 she had put men to death.

China in process of transformation.

In the last few years the leaven of reform has been working fruitfully in the Middle Kingdom. A military spirit has arisen in this state, which formerly despised the martial virtues. Under the direction of Japanese instructors a Chinese army is being constructed after European models, equipped in the European fashion. The acquisition of western knowledge is encouraged. Students are going in large numbers to foreign countries, European, American, 20,000 of them to Japan. The State encourages the process by throwing open the civil service, that is, official careers to those who obtain honors in examinations in western subjects. Schools are being opened throughout the country. Even public schools for girls have been established, a remarkable fact for any Oriental country. Railroads are being built, and the Chinese have begun the economic development of their country, and are buying back where possible the concessions for mines and railways formerly granted to foreigners. In 1906 an edict was issued aiming at the prohibition of the use of opium within ten years.

Moreover, the absolute monarchy is about to be changed into a constitutional one, the people of China are to receive political power and education. An imperial commission was sent to Europe in 1905 to study the representative systems of various countries, and on its return a committee, consisting of many high dignitaries, was appointed to study its report.

In August 1908 an official edict was issued promising, in the name of the Emperor, a constitution in 1917, and setting forth in detail the stages that will be reached each year in the conversion of the form of government until the new system is completely established. A piquant and highly modern illustration of the swift interplay of the nations in these days of world politics, of instantaneous transmission of news, is furnished by the action of Chinese reformers, who have urged that China should not lag behind Turkey and Persia, themselves very recent converts, indeed, to the faith in constitutions and parliaments, a faith which has spread so astoundingly since 1815 and which is fast winning the last retreats of absolutism.

China promised a constitution.

CHAPTER XXXI

RUSSIA SINCE THE WAR WITH JAPAN

We are now in a position to follow with some understanding the very recent history of Russia, a history at once crowded, intricate, turbulent, the outcome of which is certainly obscure, but which seems to be the dawn of a new era—a dawn, however, still heavily overcast and lowering. That history is the record of the reaction of the Japanese war upon Russia herself, a war which may prove to be as far-reaching in its effects upon the Russian state and people as it has already proved itself to be upon Japan and China.

Unpopularity in Russia of the war with Japan.

That war was from the beginning unpopular with the Russians. Consisting of a series of defeats, its unpopularity only increased, and the indignation and wrath of the people were shown during its course in many ways. The Government was justly held responsible, and was discredited by its failure. As it added greatly to the already existing discontent, the plight in which the Government found itself rendered it powerless to repress the popular expression of that discontent in the usual summary fashion. There was for many months extraordinary freedom of discussion, of the press, of speech, cut short now and then by the officials, only to break out later. The war with Japan had for the Government most unexpected and unwelcome consequences. The very winds were let loose.

Open expression of the popular discontent.

The war began early in February 1904. At a meeting of the Institute of Mining Engineers at St. Petersburg on February 23d, a resolution was passed stating "that the war with Japan has its origin in a policy conceived solely in the interests of a small privileged minority, to the detri-

ment of the vast majority of the Russian people, and that it is the result of the spirit of reckless adventure which characterizes the enterprises of the Government in the Far East." The Institute accordingly expressed its "profound dissatisfaction with the Government, which is the responsible author of this fresh national misfortune," and denounced the war as "at once inhuman and contrary to the interests of the people."

Von Plehve's iron régime.

The Minister of the Interior, in whose hands lay the maintenance of public order, was at this time Von Plehve, one of the most bitterly hated men in recent Russian history. Von Plehve had been in power since 1902, and had revealed a character of unusual harshness. He had incessantly and pitilessly prosecuted liberals everywhere, had filled the prisons with his victims, had been the center of the movement against the Finns, previously described, and seems to have secretly favored the horrible massacres of Jews which occurred at this time. He was detested as few men have been. He attempted to suppress in the usual manner the rising volume of criticism occasioned by the war by applying the same ruthless methods of breaking up meetings, exiling to Siberia students, professional men, workmen. He was killed July 1904 by a bomb thrown under his carriage by a former student. Russia breathed more easily. There immediately appeared a document which throws a remarkable light on the meaning of assassination in the minds of the more radical revolutionists in Russia. This was "an appeal to the citizens of the world," issued by the central committee of the Revolutionary Socialist party. Assuming responsibility for the "righteous act," and announcing its decision to put an end to Tsardom, it stated that Plehve had been "executed" because of the relentless policy of repression and reprisals, which he had applied against all those who strove for freedom in Russia. "The necessary violence of our methods of combat," the appeal concluded, "should not hide from any one the truth. We disapprove absolutely . . .

Assassination of Von Plehve.

A Russian defense of assassination.

a terrorist policy in countries that are free. But in Russia, where, owing to the reign of despotism, no open political discussion is possible, where there is no redress against the irresponsibility of absolute power throughout the whole bureaucratic organization, we shall be obliged to fight the violence of tyranny with the force of revolutionary right."

Nicholas II enters upon a more liberal path.

The Emperor Nicholas II now showed a disposition to depart somewhat from the rigorous policy of Von Plehve. He appointed as Minister of Home Affairs in September, Prince Sviatopolk Mirski, a man of liberal tendencies. The new minister announced "that though the Russian people are as yet unfit for constitutional government, the local representative institutions of the Empire (the zemstvos) might be given greater freedom of action and larger opportunities without risk to the established system," and he spoke of "sincere confidence in the people" as essential to good government. This aroused the hopes of the liberals. The press was allowed great freedom, which it used to express the people's demands, and in November 1904 representatives from the zemstvos were permitted to meet in St. Petersburg to state and discuss what they considered the needs of the country. Many other bodies did the same. Lawyers, academic and professional faculties, learned societies, city councils, all criticised existing abuses and demanded remedies. Never had the Russian people uttered their desires so freely. A few months before under Plehve such meetings would have been broken up and their participants treated with customary severity.

Demands of the liberals.

It appeared from all these expressions of opinion that though the liberals differed from each other on many matters, they were agreed on certain points. They demanded that the reign of law be established in Russia, that the era of bureaucratic and police control, recognizing no limits of inquisition and of cruelty, should cease. They demanded the individual rights usual in western Europe, freedom of con-

science, of speech, of publication, of public meetings and associations, of justice administered by independent judges, of legal trials for alleged lawbreakers. They also demanded greater participation of the people in local government, some sort of a national parliament which should share in making the laws of the Empire, and which should control the officials, and a national constituent assembly, to be summoned immediately, with power to frame a constitution embodying these privileges in fundamental law. The last two demands were considered by far the most important—a convention to give a constitution to Russia, and a parliament henceforth to make the laws. But, however passionate and universal the demands, the Tsar showed no inclination to grant them, and the discontent continued, fanned by the disclosures of the war, which grew ever more unpopular and disastrous as it progressed. Thousands of soldiers of the reserve, called out, escaped to Germany and Austria. Others were forced, only at the point of the bayonet, into the trains that were to carry them to Manchuria. Hundreds of thousands of workmen were thrown out of employment by the failure of business enterprises, caused by the war; the harvest was bad, and it was found that the officials were enriching themselves at the expense of the nation's honor, selling for private gain supplies intended for the army, even seizing the funds of the Red Cross Society. The war continued to be a series of humiliating and sanguinary defeats, and on January 1, 1905, came the surrender of Port Arthur after a fearful siege.

Not granted by the Tsar.

Widespread disorder.

The revolutionary agitation continued. The people desired concessions from the Tsar, but none came from him. University students in Moscow and St. Petersburg marched through the streets shouting, "Down with autocracy!" "Stop the war!" Finally, the Tsar spoke. Toward the end of December 1904 he issued a decree in reply to the public demands. In it he stated the reforms which he considered were most needed, and ordered the ministers to

The Tsar announces his intentions.

prepare the laws necessary to effect them. Some of these were identical with the wishes expressed by the zemstvos and the other assemblies, but the reformers noticed one critical omission. There was no mention of a national assembly. It was clear that, while the Emperor might grant some reforms, he had no intention of reducing his own autocratic powers, of restricting the bureaucracy, or of allowing the people any share in the government.

Popular dissatisfaction and continuance of disorder.

The agitation, therefore, continued unabated, more and more embittered as the war progressed. January was signalized by an event that aroused the horror of the civilized world—the slaughter of "Bloody Sunday" (January 22, 1905). Workmen in immense numbers, under the leadership of a radical priest, Father Gapon, tried to approach the Imperial Palace in St. Petersburg, hoping to be able to lay their grievances directly before the Emperor, as they had no faith in any of the officials. Instead of that, they were attacked by the Cossacks and the regular troops and the result was a fearful loss of life, how large cannot be accurately stated.

All through the year 1905 tumults and disturbances occurred. Prince Sviatopolk Mirski, ill, foiled at every step, and undermined by reactionaries, was replaced by Buliguin (February 1905). The Government resumed its customary methods. Deeds of violence and repression on its part were met in turn by assassinations and bomb-throwing on the part of the revolutionists. Immense strikes were organized. Peasants burned the houses of the nobles. Mutinies in the army and navy were frequent. The uncle of the Tsar, the Grand Duke Sergius, one of the most pronounced reactionaries in the Empire, who had said "the people wants the stick," was assassinated. Russia was in a state bordering on anarchy. Finally the Tsar sought to reduce the ever-mounting spirit of opposition by issuing a manifesto, concerning the representative assembly which was so vehemently demanded (August 19, 1905).

The Manifesto of August 19, 1905.

In this he announced that "while preserving the fundamental law regarding the autocratic power," he had resolved to call, not later than January 1906, a state council, or Duma, consisting of elected representatives from the whole of Russia. But this manifesto was only another disappointment to the reformers, as the Duma was to be merely a consultative body, not a real legislature, as the elections to it were to be conducted by the very class most hated and distrusted, the bureaucracy, as the working and professional classes were not given the suffrage, and as the sessions of the Duma were not to be public. How small the electorate was to be was shown from the fact that St. Petersburg, with a population of over a million and a half, would have only nine thousand five hundred voters.

Feeling, therefore, that the Emperor's concessions were inadequate and illusory, that Russia must be assured far greater liberties, the revolutionary parties continued their agitation. An agency of great effect when completely applied was now resorted to, the general strike. Under present conditions, when governments dispose of large, well-equipped armies against which the people are powerless to fight, this is a weapon of immense value. It is, however, difficult to set in operation, involving, as it does, the co-operation of vast numbers in a strike, which can be maintained only if the strikers have reserve funds large enough to prevent starvation. In Russia in October 1905 the attempt was made. It began with a railway strike, which included the whole Empire, and which cut off all communication both within Russia and with the outside world. Any one wishing to travel was forced to use the ordinary highways or the water, if that were possible. Commerce was tied up. Merchants could neither ship nor receive goods. Similar strikes occurred in most of the great factories. Practically all shops, except provision stores, were closed. In the large towns the gas and electric light companies ceased to operate. Druggists refused to sell medicines until reforms should be

The resort to the general strike.

granted. The students of the universities struck, lawyers also; the law courts were closed. No newspapers appeared. Stocks fell rapidly.

This sharp, sweeping suspension of the ordinary and necessary activities of life created an insupportable situation, and exerted a terrific pressure on the Government. It was an extraordinarily dramatic protest against misrule. Forced to yield, at least somewhat, the Tsar issued a manifesto October 30, 1905, granting "the immutable foundations of civic liberty," freedom of speech, of conscience, of association, extending the suffrage to those then lacking it, leaving the matter of the permanent franchise to be determined by the Duma, and, most important of all, establishing "as an immutable rule that no law can come into force without the approval of the Duma, and that it shall be possible for the representatives of the people to participate effectively in the supervision of the legality of the acts of the public officials." Count Witte was at the same time appointed prime minister, and Pobyedonostseff, hated by all liberals as the very soul of the cruel government of the last twenty years, was removed from his position.

The Manifesto of October, 1905.

But it was evident that the police and bureaucrats intended to continue their usual practice of breaking up meetings, shooting, and arresting at will. Moreover, the revolutionists were not satisfied with the Tsar's concessions, but demanded the convocation of an assembly elected by universal suffrage which should draw up a constitution for Russia, as a preliminary step absolutely essential to reassure the people. This the Tsar would not grant. The strike went on through November, new classes joining it, such as the letter carriers and telegraph operators. Dangerous mutinies in the army and navy were frequent, and brutal and bloody attacks upon the Jews, inspired in many cases by Government officials, shocked the western world. There was much street fighting in Moscow and other places. The Government refused the constituent assembly, but it ordered the elections

The popular demand for a constituent assembly refused.

for the Duma to be held. Moreover, it made concessions to Finland which brought peace to that distracted country, by restoring the rights enjoyed by the duchy before the late usurpations. Russia continued in a highly troubled state, in fact, an irregular kind of civil war between reactionaries seeking to recover lost ground and revolutionists bent upon preventing a return to the old conditions. That the old odious methods were still extremely vigorous was shown by the fact that, in January 1906 alone, 78 newspapers were suspended, 58 editors arrested, and thousands of people thrown into prison or exiled to Siberia, and most of Russia placed under martial law; all this after the Tsar in October had recognized the civil rights of the individual.

The Government makes concessions to Finland.

The Tsar had promised the Duma, which was to be a law-making body and was to have a supervision over the actions of officials. But before it met he proceeded to clip its wings. He issued a decree constituting the Council of the Empire, that is, a body consisting largely of official appointees from the bureaucracy, or of persons associated with the old order of things, as a kind of Upper Chamber of the legislature, of which the Duma should be the Lower. An elective element was to be introduced into the Council of the Empire. Laws must have the consent of both Council and Duma before being submitted to the Tsar for approval.

The Council of the Empire.

The elections to the Duma were held in March and April 1906, and resulted in a large majority for the Constitutional Democrats, popularly called the "Cadets," a name derived from the initial letters of the name of the party. Count Witte now resigned and was succeeded by Goremykin, whose first act was to issue in the name of the Tsar certain "organic laws," laws that could not be touched by the Duma. Thus the powers of that body were again restricted, before it had even met.

The "organic laws."

The Duma was opened by Nicholas II in person with elaborate ceremony, May 10, 1906. It was destined to have

Opening of the Duma, May 10, 1906.

a short and stormy life. It showed from the beginning that it desired a thoroughgoing reform of Russia along the well-known lines of western liberalism. It was combated by the court and bureaucratic parties, which had not been able to prevent its meeting, but which were bent upon rendering it powerless, and were only waiting for a favorable time to secure its abolition. It demanded an amnesty for all political offenders. "The first thought at the first assembly of the representatives of the Russian nation should be for those who have sacrificed their freedom for their country," said one orator. It was only able, however, to secure a partial amnesty. It demanded that the Council of the Empire, the second chamber, should be reformed, as it was under the complete control of the Emperor, and was thus able to nullify the work of the people's chamber. It demanded that the ministers be made responsible to the Duma as the only way of giving the people control over the officials. It demanded the abolition of martial law throughout the Empire, under cover of which all kinds of crimes were being perpetrated by the governing classes. It passed a bill abolishing capital punishment. As the needs of the peasants were most pressing, it demanded that the lands belonging to the state, the crown, and the monasteries be given to them on long leases.

Demands of the Duma.

The Duma lasted a little over two months. Its debates were marked by a high degree of intelligence and by frequent displays of eloquence, in which several peasants distinguished themselves. It criticised the abuses of the Government freely and scathingly. Its sessions were often stormy, the attitude of the ministers frequently contemptuous. It was foiled in all its attempts at reform by the Council of the Empire, and by the Tsar.

The impotence of the Duma.

The crucial contest was over the responsibility of ministers. The Duma demanded this as the only way of giving the people an effective participation in the government. The Tsar steadily refused. A deadlock ensued. The public

was inflamed and disorders were rife among the people. A radical party among the peasants demanded that all the land of the country be given to them outright, without payment. The Tsar cut the whole matter short by dissolving the Duma, on July 22, 1906, stating that he was "cruelly disappointed" that "the representatives of the nation, instead of applying themselves to productive legislation, had strayed into spheres beyond their competence, had inquired into the acts of local authorities established by himself, and had commented upon the imperfections of the fundamental laws, which could only be modified by his Imperial will." March 5, 1907, was fixed as the date for the meeting of a new Duma. Stolypin was appointed prime minister in the place of Goremykin. Many of the members of the Duma went to Viborg in Finland, where they issued a manifesto, signed by 230 of them, protesting against the dissolution of the Duma, and calling upon the people "to stand up for the downtrodden rights of popular representation," and to give the Government neither soldiers nor money, as it had no right to either without the consent of the people's representatives. They declared invalid all new loans that might be contracted without the approval of the Duma. As the people remained inactive, either because of indifference or because terrorized, the manifesto proved a mere flash in the pan. Most of those who signed it were prosecuted later, and were provisionally disfranchised and prevented from being elected to the second Duma.

The Duma dissolved.

Stolypin appointed chief minister.

The Viborg Manifesto.

The second Duma was opened by the Tsar March 5, 1907. It did not work to the satisfaction of the Government. Friction between it and the ministry developed early and increased steadily. Finally the Government arrested sixteen of the members and indicted many others for carrying on an alleged revolutionary propaganda. This was, of course, a vital assault upon the integrity of the assembly, a gross infringement upon even the most moderate constitutional liberties. Preparing to contest this high-handed action,

The second Duma.

the Duma was dissolved on June 16, 1907, and a new one ordered to be elected in September, and to meet in November. An imperial manifesto was issued at the same time altering the electoral law in most sweeping fashion, and practically bestowing the right of choosing the large majority of the members upon about 130,000 landowners. This also was a grave infringement upon the constitutional liberties hitherto granted, which had, among other things, promised that the electoral law should not be changed without the consent of the Duma. The Tsar asserted now that "the right of abrogating the law and replacing it by a new law belongs only to the power which gave the first electoral law—the historic power of the Tsar of Russia."

The Tsar alters the electoral system.

The third Duma.

The third Duma, thus chosen on a very limited and plutocratic suffrage, was opened on November 14, 1907, and is still in existence (1909). Though composed in large measure of reactionaries and those who were only mildly progressive, nevertheless, this assembly, which Stolypin apparently thought would be a docile instrument for the ministry, has not entirely justified his expectations. An act of some significance was its refusal by a vote of 212 to 146 to introduce the word "autocracy" into the address to the Tsar. Stolypin thereupon announced that the autocracy was the supreme power in the state, and would assert itself whenever the safety of Russia should demand it.

The autocracy asserts its supreme authority.

Thus the autocracy proclaimed anew its undiminished authority. Nevertheless, it has not yet dared to abolish the Duma outright, as urged to by the reactionaries. The Duma still exists, but is rather a consultative than a legislative body. With the mere passage of time it takes on more and more the character of a permanent institution, exerting a feeble influence on Russian affairs. However precarious its existence, however slight its power, it nevertheless represents an experiment in constitutional government from the effects of which Russia will never be able to shake herself permanently free. The difficulty of cutting

this experiment short, of abolishing the institution outright, has been increased by the trend of events outside Russia, with Turkey, Persia, and China becoming, or preparing to become, constitutional states of the modern type. A decent regard for the opinions of mankind will tend to thwart a complete or permanent reversion to outlived forms of government.

The transformation of the mir.

Far the most important measure sanctioned by the third Duma was the law passed early in 1909 providing for the ultimate break-up of the historic form of the village commune, or mir, the freeing of the peasants from the previous authority of the mir, the substitution of individual ownership of the land for the collective ownership, hitherto the chief and unique characteristic of the commune. This is a great agrarian reform, destined inevitably to have momentous consequences, though whether on the whole beneficial or disastrous it is impossible to foresee. The idea at the basis of the bill, which has received the sanction of the Tsar, was first brought forward by Count Witte, was later taken up by Stolypin and promulgated in the form of provisional decrees by the Emperor. The bill represents the will of the Government, not a concession wrung from it by the Duma. The Duma has merely consented.

The restoration of the liberties of Finland.

Meanwhile, Finland fared better than Russia. The attacks upon the historic institutions and liberties of the Finns, the attempted Russification of the duchy, have been described. The Finns, helpless before the overwhelming power of the Russian autocrat, were to find advantage in his discomfiture at the hands of the Japanese. Roused by the anarchy and impotence of the Government in 1905, they demanded vehemently the restoration of the constitutional rights of their country, and to this end ordered a general strike. On November 4, 1905, the Tsar capitulated, issuing a decree which granted the demands of the Finns and annulled the whole series of despotic measures enacted from

1899 to 1903. Finland was once more a free country, in the possession of a responsible government of her own. No sooner had the Finns recovered their rights and power than they proceeded to reform their government along democratic lines. A bill was passed in May 1906, sanctioned by the Tsar, altering the system of representation. In the place of the previous four Chambers, or Estates, there was henceforth to be a single Chamber of two hundred members, of whom sixty were to form a Grand Committee, with certain powers to prevent hasty legislation. Universal suffrage was established; women, as well as men, who have reached their twenty-fourth year, were given the right to vote, and were declared eligible for membership in the Chamber. Proportional representation was also instituted.

The Finnish parliament altered.

The first elections to the new Chamber took place in April 1907. Eighty Socialists were returned out of the two hundred members, and nineteen women were chosen members, of whom one was a journalist, one a school-teacher, one a dressmaker, one a weaver, one an agitator for woman's rights, one the president of the Servant Girls' Union. Thus, for the first time in history, certain social classes, hitherto without political power, are directly represented in a European parliament. In the elections of 1908 the number of women absentees from the polls was considerably less than that of men absentees.

Renewed troubles in Finland.

Troublous times began again for Finland in 1908. The question of the powers of the Finnish Diet, of the relations of the Grand Duchy to the Empire as a whole was raised once more and rapidly became acute. The Russian Government was resolved to bring Finland under close control in military and financial affairs, on the ground that she did not bear her share of the burdens of the State and that uniformity of legislation was necessary in matters so vital. The Finns planted themselves firmly upon their constitutional rights and were unconciliatory. Toward the end of 1909 the autonomy of their country seemed to be drawing to its close

CHAPTER XXXII

CERTAIN FEATURES OF MODERN PROGRESS

It is impossible within the limits of a single volume to present an adequate record of the nineteenth century, in all its rich complexity. Many aspects of its history, in themselves of the first importance, must be ignored or dismissed with a mere allusion. It was a century of revolution—revolution in government, revolution in the material conditions and circumstances of life, revolution in knowledge and in mental outlook. We have been concerned chiefly with the record of its political and social changes. But in every sphere of endeavor the militant human spirit expressed its power. It was a century that must remain memorable by reason of the originality, the brilliancy, and the solidity of its achievements. To appraise definitively its significance is, of course, impossible. To feel the fulness of its power one must study it from many points of view, must contemplate it from many angles, an undertaking from which we are precluded here.

Literature.

It was a century of literature, copious, various in form and content, diverse in its effects. Literature was a mirror of a stormy, changeful period and a dynamic force in the political, social, religious, and intellectual struggles of the age, for it was not its own excuse for being, but must serve some cause, must advance some propaganda. That the influence of literature upon events and of events upon literature has been varied and profoundly significant, the history of the great movements of the age, nationalistic, imperialistic, democratic, humanitarian, abundantly proves.

Not only was it a century of literature but it was a cen-

Music.

tury of music. "Music," says an accomplished critic, "is the only one of the fine arts of which it can be said that it reached its highest development in the nineteenth century. . . . It is the modern art *par excellence*." [1]

It was a century in which the kindlier feelings of men gained a genial efflorescence, shown in their increasing desires to alleviate suffering and distress, their growing sensitiveness to cruelty and injustice, the disposition more and more prevalent to aid the unfortunate, the defective, the stricken; to the strength of which emotion the hospitals, asylums, schools, retreats, and various relief services of every city and state bear vivid testimony, as does also much of the humanitarian legislation previously described. This tendency became steadily more pronounced as the century wore to its close and passed over into the new.

It was a supremely brilliant century of science. In physics, in chemistry, in astronomy, in geology, in biology, in the various historical, legal, political, and social studies, in philosophy, in philology, in the critical study of literature and art, in every branch of investigation, the activity was unremitting, the cumulative result revolutionary and stupendous. Not only were the confines of knowledge greatly widened, but the methods of its acquisition and dissemination were multiplied and perfected. The work was international in character, the product of many minds, of many laboratories. That the well-being of men was vastly furthered by it all is most obvious. It would be impossible, for instance, to exaggerate the relief from fearful suffering, the gain to human life, brought about by the two discoveries of anesthetics and antiseptics, products of the scientific investigations of the century. In two respects, which have a closer connection with the general character of this volume, it is desirable to show how science has revolutionized the

Science.

[1] H. T. Finck in *The Nineteenth Century*, "A Review of Progress," 239-240.

HELÈNE, QUEEN OF ITALY, AND HER TWO DAUGHTERS, PRINCESS IOLANDE (BORN 1901) AND PRINCESS MATILDA (BORN 1902).

material conditions of life, by its application to industry and to war.

The transformation of industry and commerce accomplished in the century is unique in the history of the world, a transformation so sweeping that in this respect the present age differs more from that of Louis XVIII than did his from that of Rameses II. This transformation has been the result of a series of discoveries and inventions too numerous even to mention. Among these, one stands pre-eminent, the placing at the disposition of man of a new motive force of incomparable consequence, steam, rendered available by the perfection of an engine for the transmission of its power. James Watt rendered this service to the race at the close of the eighteenth century, but it was not until the nineteenth was well advanced that its possibilities, the vast range of its utility, were clearly established.

The age of steam.

Consider the significance of the new agency. Up to the advent of the age of steam, industry and commerce were essentially what they had been for many centuries. Previously the only motive force had come from animal strength, and from wind and falling water. Mankind had very few machines, but manufacture was literally production by hand, and was carried on in small shops generally connected with the home of the manufacturer. There, in the midst of a few workmen, the proprietor himself worked. The implements were few, the relations of master and journeyman and apprentice intimate and constant, the differences of their conditions comparatively slight. Industry was truly domestic. In general each town produced the commodities which it required. Production was on a small scale, and was designed largely for the local market. Necessarily so, for the difficulty of communication restricted commerce. Down to the nineteenth century men traveled and goods were carried in the way with which the world had been familiar since time began. Only by horse or by boat could merchandise be conveyed. Roads were few in number, poor in quality,

bridges were woefully infrequent, so that traveler and car were stopped by rivers, over which they were carried slowly and often with danger, by boats or ferries. Practically no great improvement had been made in locomotion since the earliest times, save in the betterment of roadbeds and the establishment of regular stage routes. Napoleon, fleeing from Russia in 1812, and anxious to reach Paris as quickly as possible, left the army, and with a traveling and sleeping carriage and constant relays of fresh horses, succeeded, by extraordinary efforts day and night, in covering a thousand miles in five days, which was an average rate of eight or nine miles an hour, a remarkable ride for an age of horse conveyance. Where the Emperor of the French, commanding all the resources of his time, could do no better, of course the average traveler moved much more slowly and merchandise more slowly still.

The transmission of information could not be more rapid than the means of locomotion. The postal service was primitive, postage was high and very variable, and was paid by the receiver. In France, since 1793, there was a kind of aërial telegraph which, by means of signals, operated from the tops of poles, like those along the lines of modern railroads, could transmit intelligence from Paris to other cities rapidly. But this invention was monopolized by the State, and moreover ceased to operate when darkness or rain came on.

Rise of the factory system.

Into this world of small industries and limited commerce came the revolutionary steam engine, destined to effect an economic transformation unparalleled in the history of the race. It was applied to industry, then to commerce. First employed in mining, it was shortly adopted by the manufacturers of cotton and woolen goods, to give the force for the inventions of Crompton and Arkwright and Hargreaves and Cartwright. Out of it the modern factory system of production arose, and it became the throbbing heart of every industry. The machine superseded the hand of man as the

chief element in production, increasing the output ultimately in certain lines a hundred, even a thousand-fold. Domestic industry waned and disappeared. Manufacturing became concentrated in large establishments employing hundreds of men, and ultimately thousands. And this concentration of industry caused the rapid growth of cities, one of the characteristic features of the century.

But there was a limit imposed upon the utility of the steam engine in industry. Production on the large scale involved necessarily two other factors—larger sources of supply from which to draw the raw materials, larger markets for the finished products. Right here the inadequate means of communication called halt. The necessity for improvement was imperative. A single illustration is sufficient evidence. The port of Liverpool and the great manufacturing city of Manchester were separated by only about thirty miles. Three canals connected them, yet traffic on them was so congested that it sometimes took a month for cotton to reach the factories from the sea.[1] The new machine industry was in danger of strangulation. Moreover the size of cities was conditioned upon the ability to procure food supplies, an ability strictly limited by the existing methods of communication.

Steam navigation.

The steam engine, applied to locomotion, came to the rescue of the steam engine applied to looms and spindles. And first to locomotion on water. Fulton's steamboat, the *Clermont*, leaving New York August 7, 1807, arrived at Albany, a hundred and fifty miles distant, in thirty-two hours. The practicability of steam navigation was thus, after much experimenting, definitively established. But steam navigation only slowly eclipsed navigation by sail. In 1814 there were only two steamers, with a tonnage of 426 tons, in the whole British Empire. In 1816, Liverpool, which now has the largest steam fleet in existence, did not have a single steamer. It is impossible here to trace the growth of this

[1] Day, A History of Commerce, 296.

method of locomotion. Its expansion was reasonably rap
It was at first thought impossible to construct ships lar
enough to carry sufficient coal for long voyages. It was n
until 1838 that a ship relying solely upon steam propulsi
The Great Western. crossed the Atlantic Ocean. The *Great Western*, a Briti
vessel, sailed from Bristol to New York in fifteen days, to t
discomfiture of those who were at that very time showing t
impossibility of such a feat. "It was proved by fluxiona
calculus," wrote Carlyle, "that steamers could never g
across from the farthest point of Ireland to the nearest
Newfoundland; impelling force, resisting force, maximu
here, minimum there; by law of nature, and geometric den
onstration;—what could be done? The *Great Weste*
could weigh anchor from Bristol Port; that could be don
The *Great Western*, bounding safe through the gullets o
the Hudson, threw her cable out on the capstan of Ne
York, and left our still moist paper demonstration to dr
itself at leisure." The experimental stage was over. I
1840, Samuel Cunard, a native of Nova Scotia, living i
England, founded the first regular transatlantic steamshi
line, thus raising his name out of obscurity forever. In 184
the Hamburg-American, in 1857 the North German Lloy
in 1862 the French lines began their notable careers, th
two former now constituting veritable fleets and serving a
parts of the globe.

The invention of the railroad. But more important still was the application of steam t
locomotion on land, the invention of the railroad. This, lik
most inventions, was a slow growth. In the mines an
quarries of England carts had for some time been draw
on rails made at first of wood, later of iron. It was foun
that horses could thus draw much heavier loads, the frictio
of the wheel being reduced. The next step was to substitut
the steam engine for the horse. Several men were studyin
this problem in the early nineteenth century. William Hedley
chief engineer of a colliery near Newcastle, constructed i
1813 a locomotive, *Puffing Billy*, which worked fairly well

The significance of George Stephenson lies in the fact that by his inventions and improvements, extending through many years he made it "actually cheaper," to use his own words, "for the poor man to go by steam than to walk." His first locomotive, constructed in 1814, proved capable of hauling coal at the rate of three miles an hour but at such a rate was not commercially valuable. He perfected his machine by increasing the power of the boiler so that the *Rocket* was able to make thirty miles an hour at the opening of the Liverpool and Manchester railway in 1830. The experimental stage was over. The railway was a proved success. Construction began forthwith and has continued ever since. The development of the new means of locomotion has proceeded with the development of chemistry, metallurgy, mechanics, engineering, electricity. Rails have been constantly improved, locomotives augmented in drawing power, bridges flung over rivers and ravines, tunnels cut through mountains. Navigation, too, has had its record of triumph. Steamships, plying regularly and in all directions, have become larger and larger, swifter and swifter, more and more numerous. Traveling and transportation have thus been revolutionized by methods entirely dissimilar from those in existence during all the previous history of mankind. They represent not a difference of degree, but of kind.

Importance of railroads.

It is railways that have rendered possible the remarkable economic transformation of the world, which must otherwise have been checked in mid-process. They have also aided in the work of nation-building, of empire-building, and have facilitated political concentration. They have become powerful auxiliaries in war. "The lack," says President Hadley, "of a few miles of railroad connection in 1859 probably caused Austria to lose the battles of Solferino and Magenta, and changed the whole destiny of Italy. The energetic control and use of every railroad line in 1870 enabled Germany to put her troops where they were most needed, and strike those

telling blows which virtually decided the contest in a few days." [1]

Another agency has co-operated with steam in the transformation of the conditions of modern industry and commerce, electricity. It has become, within very recent years, the source of light and heat and motive power. But the marvelous service it has thus far rendered has been the instantaneous transmission of intelligence by the telegraph, which became practicable after 1835, and by the telephone, invented much later by Alexander Graham Bell (1876), only several years later still to become commercially valuable. Within the last twenty years the application of this new agency to life has made gigantic strides.

Electricity.

The result of all this development, of the railroads, rendering possible the extraordinary expansion of industry, of industrial inventions, rendering possible the extraordinary expansion of the railroads—for the latter are both cause and effect—and of this instantaneous transmission of intelligence by wire and cable, and its publication by the marvelously improved printing presses of our day, is the modern world of business which affects constantly and intimately the life of every man, the activity of every government. Humanity occupies a stronger position than ever before. Its increased knowledge and control of the forces of nature have enabled it to produce in immensely greater quantities the necessities and comforts and luxuries of life. The application of machinery to production, in agriculture, in manufacture, in transportation, has increased vastly the quantity and reduced the price of most commodities. Many products which only the well-to-do could formerly enjoy are now within the reach of the millions. The plane of living has been distinctly raised. The higher standard begets a desire for a standard higher still.

Standard of living.

But while general wealth has advanced, and is advancing with enormous strides, and while all have shared in the pro-

[1] Hadley, Railroad Transportation, 15.

digious material progress, there is indubitably a growing feeling that the distribution of the benefits has been and is far from equitable and healthy, that the world's manual laborers have not gained from these improved methods of production as much as, in the interests of society as a whole, they should have gained. There is an increasing conviction in men's minds, to which the history of the last thirty or forty years bears cumulative witness on every page, that, given man's unexampled power over creative forces which formerly went to waste, poverty has no place in the modern world save as the doom of indolence or vice. Yet poverty abounds which cannot be justly ascribed to either.

Out of this conviction and out of the disillusions and sufferings of the millions who have flocked to the cities, allured by higher wages, have sprung various movements, of which socialism is but one, although the most conspicuous and the most potent. And discontent now possesses powers which it has never previously possessed. For the masses of to-day have been educated in the public schools, whereas, in 1815, they could, as a rule, neither read nor write; have received a discipline in armies and in factories, a training in co-operation and management and judgment in their unions; have newspapers which conduct their propaganda, and express their views; have acquired a taste for politics, which at the beginning of the century was the characteristic of a small minority; and exercise an increasing power in most states as they possess the suffrage.

Popular discontent.

The supreme result of the economic and the democratic evolution of the century in the domain of politics is the sharpening concentration of the thought of our day upon the social and economic problems to which it itself has given rise. For, more and more penetrating into the foreground of the consciousness of every nation, is the condition of the most numerous class and the duty of society to improve it. Social amelioration is one of the insistent questions of the

twentieth century, a question which will be answered, if at all, by democracy, the product of the nineteenth.

There is another problem created by the advance of science which engrosses more and more the attention of thoughtful men. The rise and development of the militaristic spirit have been shown in the preceding pages. The Prussian military system, marked by scientific thoroughness and efficiency, has been adopted by all the countries of Europe. Europe is to-day what she has never been before, literally an armed continent. The burden is heavy and its weight increases with every advance of science. For every discovery of a new explosive, every improvement in weapons is immediately adopted, regardless of expense. Thus old equipment becomes obsolete before it has ever been used in actual war. The rivalry of the nations to have the most perfect instruments of destruction, the strongest army and the strongest navy, is one of the most conspicuous features of the world to-day. Ships of war were made so strong that they could resist attack. New projectiles of terrific force were consequently required and the torpedo was invented. A new agency would be useful to discharge this missile and thus the torpedo boat was developed. To neutralize it was therefore the immediate necessity and the torpedo-boat destroyer was the result. Boats that could navigate beneath the waters would have an obvious advantage over those that could be seen, and the submarine was provided for this need. And now we are about to take possession of the air with dirigible balloons and aëroplanes, as aërial auxiliaries of war. And thus man's immemorial occupation, war, gains from the advance of science and contributes to that advance. The wars of the past were fought on the surface of the globe. Those of the future will be fought in the heavens above, and in the earth beneath, and in the waters under the earth.

Spread of militarism.

But all this is tremendously expensive. It costs more than a hundred thousand dollars to construct the largest coast defense gun, which carries twenty-one miles, and its single

Cost of modern instruments of war.

discharge costs a thousand dollars. Ten millions are necessary to build a *Dreadnought*. The debts of European countries have been nearly doubled during the last thirty years, largely because of military expenditures. The military budgets of European states in this day of "armed peace" amount to not far from a billion and a half dollars a year, half as much again as the indemnity exacted by Germany from France in 1871. Peace hath her price no less than war. The burden is so heavy, the rivalry so keen that it has given rise to a movement which aims to end it. The very aggravation of the evil prompts a desire for its cure.

In the summer of 1898 the civil and military authorities of Russia were considering how they might escape the necessity of replacing an antiquated kind of artillery with a more modern but very expensive one. Out of this discussion emerged the idea that it would be desirable, if possible, to check the increase of armaments. This could not be achieved by one nation alone but must be done by all, if done at all. The outcome of these discussions was the issuance by the Tsar, Nicholas II, on August 24, 1898, of a communication to those nations which were represented by diplomatic agents at the Court of St. Petersburg, suggesting that an international conference be held to consider the general problem. This paper is very significant. Some of its statements deserve to be quoted: "In the course of the last twenty years the longings for a general appeasement have become especially pronounced in the consciences of civilized nations. The preservation of peace has been put forward as the object of international policy; in its name great states have concluded between themselves powerful alliances; it is the better to guarantee peace that they have developed, in proportions hitherto unprecedented, their military powers, and still continue to increase them without shrinking from any sacrifice. . . . All these efforts, nevertheless, have not yet been able to bring about the beneficent results of the desired pacification. The financial charges, following an upward

Nicholas II and the limitation of armaments.

march, strike the public prosperity at its very source. The intellectual and physical strength of the nations, labor and capital, are for the major part diverted from their natural application, and unproductively consumed. Hundreds of millions are devoted to acquiring terrible engines of destruction which, though to-day regarded as the last word of science, are destined to-morrow to lose all value, in consequence of some fresh discovery in the same field. National culture, economic progress, and the production of wealth are either paralyzed or checked in their development. . . . It appears evident then that, if this state of things were prolonged, it would inevitably lead to the very cataclysm which it is designed to avert, and the horrors of which make every thinking man shudder in advance."

The First Peace Conference at the Hague.

The conference, thus suggested by the Tsar, was held at the Hague in 1899. Twenty-six of the fifty-nine sovereign governments of the world were represented by one hundred members. Twenty of these states were European, four were Asiatic—China, Japan, Persia, and Siam,—and two were American—the United States and Mexico. The Conference was opened on the 18th of May and closed on July 29th.

Address of M. de Staal.

That the problem concerned all the world, that Asia and America were as truly involved as Europe, that the day of isolation is over, when a nation may live unto itself, was shown in the address of the President of the Conference, M. de Staal, a Russian delegate. "We perceive between nations," said he, "an amount of material and moral interests which is constantly increasing. The ties which unite all parts of the human family are ever becoming closer. A nation could not remain isolated if it wished. . . . If, therefore, the nations are united by ties so multifarious, is there no room for seeking the consequences arising from this fact? When a dispute arises between two or more nations, others, without being concerned directly, are profoundly affected. The consequences of an international conflict occurring in any portion of the globe are felt on all sides. It is for this reason that

outsiders cannot remain indifferent to the conflict—they are bound to endeavor to appease it by conciliatory action." Among the means suggested are mediation and arbitration. On another occasion the same member said: "The forces of human activity are absorbed in an increasing proportion by the expenses of the military and naval budgets. . . . Armed peace to-day causes more considerable expense than the most burdensome war of modern times," and another Russian delegate exclaimed: "The idea of the Emperor of Russia is grand and generous. . . . If not this first Conference, it will be a future Conference which will accept the idea, for it responds to the wants of all nations."

Address of General von Schwarzhoff.

A member of the German delegation, General von Schwarzhoff, however, struck the opposite note. "I can hardly believe that among my honored colleagues there is a single one ready to state that his Sovereign, his Government, is engaged in working for the inevitable ruin, the slow but sure annihilation of his country. . . . So far as Germany is concerned, I am able completely to reassure her friends and to relieve all well-meant anxiety. The German people is not crushed under the weight of charges and taxes,—it is not hanging on the brink of an abyss; it is not approaching exhaustion and ruin. Quite the contrary: public and private wealth is increasing, the general welfare and standard of life is being raised from one year to another. So far as compulsory military service is concerned, which is so closely connected with these questions, the German does not regard this as a heavy burden, but as a sacred and patriotic duty to which he owes his country's existence, its prosperity, and its future."

Address of M. Bourgeois.

A French representative, M. Bourgeois, replied that General von Schwarzhoff "will surely recognize with me that, if in his country, as well as in mine, the great resources, which are now devoted to military organization, could, at least in part, be put to the service of peaceful and productive activity, the grand total of the prosperity of each country would not

cease to increase at an even more rapid rate." . . . And he added: "The object of civilization seems to us to be to abolish, more and more, the struggle for life between men, and to put in its stead an accord between them for the struggle against the unrelenting forces of matter."

The great military powers had spoken. The feeling of the lesser states was voiced by a representative of Bulgaria who declared "that armed peace was ruinous, especially for small countries whose wants were enormous, and who had everything to gain by using their resources for the development of industry, agriculture, and general progress." [1]

With such differences of opinion the conference was unable to reach any agreement upon the fundamental question which had given rise to its convocation. It could only adopt a resolution expressing the belief that "a limitation of the military expenses which now burden the world is greatly to be desired in the interests of the material and moral well-being of mankind" and the desire that the governments "shall take up the study of the possibility of an agreement concerning the limitation of armed forces on land and sea, and of military budgets."

Establishment of a Permanent Court of Arbitration.

With regard to arbitration the Conference was more successful. It established a Permanent Court of Arbitration for the purpose of facilitating arbitration in the case of international disputes which it has been found impossible to settle by the ordinary means of diplomacy. The Court does not consist of a group of judges holding sessions at stated times to try such cases may be brought before it. But it is provided that each power "shall select not more than four persons of recognized competence in questions of international law, enjoying the highest moral reputation and disposed to accept the duties of arbitrators," and that their appointment shall run for six years and may be renewed. Out of this long list the powers at variance choose, in a manner indicated,

[1] Quotations are from Holls, The Peace Conference at the Hague, Chapters II and III passim.

HUMBERT (1844–1900), KING OF ITALY, SON OF VICTOR EMMANUEL II. AND FATHER OF THE PRESENT KING.

Lincoln Sea
Grant Ld.
Hall Ld.
Grinnell Ld.
Washington Ld.
Inglefield Ld.
Prudhoe Ld.
Parry Is.
Melville I.
Banks Land
Melville Sd.
Baffin Bay
Baffin Ld.
Pr. Albert Land
Greenland
Arctic Circle
Alaska
Hudson Bay
Labrador
Canada
Aleutian Is.
Vancouver I.
Victoria
Portland
San Francisco
Washington
Philadelphia
Boston
New York
Chicago
Bermudas I.
Charleston
Mexico
Havana
Jamaica
Haiti
Trinidad
Tropic of Cancer
Equator
Tropic of Capricorn
Galapagos Is.
Hawaii
Marquesas Is.
Society Is.
Tahiti
Easter I.
Juan Fernandez
Falkland Is.
Tierra del Fuego
Magellan Str.
S. Georgia I.
Sandwich I.
S. Orkney Is.
Graham Land
Alexander I Land
Pacific Ocean
Atlantic Ocean
Florida
Bahama I.
Cuba
Caicos I.
Jamaica
Kingston
Haiti
Porto Rico
Virgin Is.
Leeward Is.
Barbadoes
Martinique
Dominica
Guadeloupe
Antigua
Montserrat
St. Kitts
Nevis
St. Vincent
Grenada
Tobago
Trinidad
Caracas
Venezuela
Colombia
Panama
Costa Rica
Nicaragua
Honduras
Yucatan
Campeche
Vera Cruz
Mexico
Guatemala
Salvador
Nicaragua
Costa Rica
Panama
Colombia
Venezuela
Guiana
Brazil
Peru
Bolivia
Chile
Argentina
Paraguay
Uruguay
Buenos Ayres
Rio de Janeiro
Bahia
Pernambuco
Para
Amazon R.
Orinoco R.
Magdalena R.
Mississippi R.
Missouri R.
Rio Grande
Colorado R.
Columbia R.
Yukon R.
Mackenzie R.
Hudson Str.
Davis Str.
Baffin Bay
Greenland
Iceland
Azores
Madeira
Canary Is.
Cape Verde Is.
Fernando Noronha
St. Helena
Ascension I.
Tristan da Cunha
Gough I.
Bouvet I.
Kerguelen I.
Prince Edward I.
Crozet Is.
St. Paul I.
Amsterdam I.
Christmas I.
Howland I.
Baker I.
Phoenix Is.
Tokelau Is.
Manihiki Is.
Suvarov I.
Samoa Is.
Tonga Is.
Fiji Is.
Tahiti
Society Is.
Marquesas Is.
Pitcairn I.
Easter I.
Juan Fernandez
Sala y Gomez
Sisler I.
Clipperton I.
Revilla Gigedo Is.
Galapagos Is.
Malpelo I.
Cocos I.
Palmyra I.
Johnston I.
Necker I.
Hawaii
Honolulu
Maui
Oahu
Kauai
Niihau
Molokai
Lanai
Kahoolawe
Hawaiian Is.
Aleutian Is.
Unimak I.
Attu I.
Kamchatka
Behring Str.
Behring Sea
Behring I.
Copper I.
Kodiak I.
Queen Charlotte Is.
Vancouver I.
Victoria
Portland
San Francisco
Sitka
Juneau
Dawson
Klondike
Yukon R.
Mackenzie R.
Great Bear L.
Great Slave L.
Athabasca L.
Winnipeg L.
Lake of the Woods
Lake Superior
Lake Michigan
Lake Huron
Lake Erie
Lake Ontario
Hudson Bay
Labrador
Newfoundland
St. John's
Quebec
Montreal
Ottawa
Toronto
Winnipeg
Regina
Calgary
Edmonton
Prince Albert
Saskatoon
Moose Jaw
Medicine Hat
Banff
Vancouver
Victoria
Portland
San Francisco
Los Angeles
San Diego
Salt Lake City
Denver
Cheyenne
Omaha
Kansas City
St. Louis
Chicago
Detroit
Cleveland
Buffalo
Pittsburg
Philadelphia
New York
Boston
Washington
Richmond
Norfolk
Charleston
Savannah
Jacksonville
Tampa
Key West
Florida
Bahama I.
Cuba
Havana
Jamaica
Kingston
Haiti
Port au Prince
Porto Rico
San Juan

French
Spanish
Danish
Belgian
Italian
POSSESSIONS
of the
AN POWERS
RESENT TIME.
East Longitude from Greenwich.
0 15 30 45 60 75 90 105 120 135 150 165
OCEAN
INDIAN
EMPIRE
Arctic Circle
Tropic of Cancer
Equator
Tropic of Capricorn
Antarctic Circle
New Siberia Is
Franz Josef Ld
Spitzbergen
Bear I
Nova Zembla
Archangel
Petersburg
Moscow
Orenburg
Tobolsk
Yakutsk
Irkutsk
Okhotsk
Kamchatka
Commander Is
Aleutian Is
Peter Pauls H.
Nikolaevski
Sakhalin
Japanese Empire
Kurile Is
Mongolia
Pekuin
Yedo
Nagasaki
Bonin Is
Vulcan Is
Marcus Is
Marianna Is
Caroline Is
Pelew Is
Gilbert Is
Marshall Arch
Ratak
Yalut
Kusaie
Ponape
Hokio
Brown I
Prendergast I
Sapan
Guam
Yap
Mindanao
Luzon
Manilla
Formosa
Hong Kong
Canton
Macao
Hainan
Tonquin
Siam
Bangkok
Singapore
Malacca
Penang
Sumatra
Java
Borneo
Celebes
Timor
Ceram
Banda Is
Amboyna
Batavia
Sourabaya
Timor Laut
Arafura Sea
Torres Str
Gulf of Carpentaria
Gulf of Bengal
Ceylon
Colombo
Madras
Pondicherry
Karikal
Mahe
Calicut
Bombay
Surat
Diu
Muscat
Maskat
Karachi
Kurrachee
Hyderabad
Delhi
Agra
Lahore
Cashmere
Candahar
Cabul
Herat
Persia
Teheran
Ispahan
Shiraz
Bushire
Bussorah
Bagdad
Mosul
Aleppo
Damascus
Jerusalem
Beyrout
Smyrna
Constantinople
Odessa
Sebastopol
Crimea
Caucasus
Caspian Sea
Aral Sea
Khiva
Tashkent
Samarcand
Bokhara
Kashgar
Yarkand
Khotan
Suchau
Turfan
Hami
Lake Baikal
Lake Tengri
Lake Dalai
Lake Kuku Nor
Lake Lop Nor
Lake Aksai Chin
Lake Manasarowar
Lake Yamdok
Lake Palti
Lake Tsomoriri
Lake Pangkong
Lake Chaka
Lake Tsaidam
Lake Koko Nor
Lake Tali Nor
Lake Yung Ning
Lake Tung Ting
Lake Poyang
Lake Tai
Lake Hung Tse
Lake Ta Tung
Lake Ngan Hwui
Lake Kiang Su

the judges who shall decide any given case. When in the discharge of their duties, such judges are to have the privileges and immunities enjoyed by diplomatic agents.

Recourse to this Court is optional, but the Court is always ready to be invoked. Arbitration is entirely voluntary with the parties to a quarrel, but if they wish to arbitrate, the machinery is at hand, a fact which is, perhaps, an encouragement to its use.

The work of the First Peace Conference was very limited and modest, yet encouraging. But that the new century was to bring not peace but a sword, that force still ruled the world, was shortly apparent. Those who were optimistic about the rapid spread of arbitration as a principle destined to regulate the international relations of the future were sadly disappointed by the meager results of the Conference, and were still more depressed by subsequent events.

The twentieth century opens with wars.

The nineteenth century had been ushered in by a series of wars of unexampled magnitude and of shattering effect. The twentieth century also opened with conflicts on an even vaster scale, involving larger armies, and likely to prove of still deeper import. The very location of the theaters of war in the two cases exemplifies admirably the changes that have come over the world during a hundred years. The wars of Napoleon were fought in the very heart of Europe. Those of the opening decade of the twentieth century were fought in eastern Asia and southern Africa, regions that for Napoleon, whose imagination, however, was quite lively, were the very confines of the world. Russia fought in Manchuria, England fought in the Transvaal, five thousand miles and more from the base of supplies. Distance has been annihilated. Again, both wars arose largely out of the ambitions of modern commerce, were expressions of the expansive, aggressive character of modern business, the relentless pressure of economic interests in the world of to-day, of what we call, in short, imperialism.

During this decade, also, the expenditures of European

states upon armies and navies continued to increase, a at an even faster rate than ever. During the eight yea from 1898 to 1906, they augmented nearly £70,000,0 the sum total mounting from £250,000,000 to £320,000,0

The Second Peace Conference at the Hague.

Such was the disappointing sequel of the Hague Conf ence. But despite discouragements the friends of peace we active, and finally brought about the Second Conference the Hague in 1907. This also was called by Nicholas I though President Roosevelt had first taken the initiati The Second Conference was in session from June 15th October 18th. It was attended by representatives fr forty-four of the world's fifty-seven states, claiming so ereignty in 1907. The number of countries represented this Conference, therefore, was nearly double that represent in the first, and the number of members was more th double, mounting from one hundred to two hundred a fifty-six. The chief additions came from the republics Central and South America. The number of American go ernments represented rose, indeed, from two to ninetee Twenty-one European, nineteen American, and four Asiat states sent delegates to this Second Conference. Its membe ship illustrated excellently certain features of our day, amon others the indubitable fact that we live in an age of wor politics, that isolation no longer exists, either of nations of hemispheres. The Conference was not European but i ternational,—the majority of the states were non-Europea

Work of the Conference.

The Second Conference accomplished much useful work the adoption of conventions regulating the actual condu of war in more humane fashion, and in defining certa aspects of international law with greater precision tha heretofore. But, concerning compulsory arbitration, a concerning disarmament or the limitation of armament nothing was achieved. It passed this resolution: "The Co ference confirms the resolution adopted by the Conference 1899 in regard to the restriction of military expenditure and, since military expenditures have increased considerabl

in nearly every country since the said year, the Conference declares that it is highly desirable to see the governments take up the serious study of the question."

This platonic resolution was adopted unanimously. A grim commentary on its importance in the eyes of the governments is contained in their naval programmes for 1908 and 1909, which included larger appropriations than ever. Even nations which have hitherto done without ships of the *Dreadnought* type have begun to enter the costly competition, such as Brazil, Austria-Hungary, and Italy, while Great Britain, Germany, and the United States are straining every nerve to surpass their rivals. It is estimated that the armies of Europe number about four million men on a peace footing, about ten million on a war footing, and that the cost of maintaining the armies and navies of Great Britain, Germany, and France alone amounts annually to nearly nine hundred million dollars (1909).

Cost of the policy of blood and iron.

Whether the Hague Conferences will be reckoned in history as simply inconsequential outbursts of sentiment, as merely the baseless fabric of a vision, or whether they will be looked upon as the small beginnings of great institutions, remains to be seen. Meanwhile, the comment of Elihu Root, at that time American Secretary of State, may be quoted: "Each Conference will inevitably make further progress and, by successive steps, results may be accomplished which have formerly appeared impossible. . . . The most valuable result of the Conference of 1899 was that it made the work of the Conference of 1907 possible. The achievements of the two Conferences justify the belief that the world has entered upon an orderly process through which, step by step, in successive conferences, each taking the work of its predecessor as its point of departure, there may be continual progress toward making the practice of civilized nations conform to their peaceful professions." [1]

Significance of the Peace Conferences.

The Hague Conference of 1907 was more representative

[1] Hull, The Two Hague Conferences, 503.

than the Congress of Vienna of 1815, with which this history opened, for it represented practically the whole human race. If the movement inaugurated in 1898 should, in the long result of time, facilitate the resort to arbitration as the usual procedure of nations in their relations with each other, Nicholas II would have been instrumental in founding an alliance far more holy than the one to which his predecessor on the Russian throne gave such celebrity in the early nineteenth century. The origins of the British Parliament and of the British Constitution were modest, indeed. But the nineteenth century saw every nation struggling to gain the political institutions which England had been fashioning thoughout the centuries. Will arbitration enter into the mentality of the race, will it find the same solid lodgment amid the facts of life, as have parliamentarism and constitutionalism? And if so, will it require as many centuries?

Arbitration.

The historian, having reached the point of interrogation, may, in all comity, leave the answer to his question to the prophet or to the future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

GENERAL HISTORIES

Cambridge Modern History, vol. X, *The Restoration,* vol. XI, *The Growth of Nationalities,* and vol. XII, *The Latest Age* (announced). The most considerable modern work in English. A co-operative history written by various English and Continental scholars, and including chapters on economic and literary as well as political history. Lacks unity but is critical and informing. Is a kind of historical encyclopedia packed full of facts. A useful feature is the bibliographies connected with each chapter which are extensive lists without criticism or description.

Seignobos, C., *A Political History of Europe Since 1814.* Translation edited by S. M. Macvane. Brings the history of each country down to about 1897. Objective, impartial. A strictly political history. Each chapter has an excellent, brief, critical bibliography.

Fyffe, C. A., *History of Modern Europe.* Published in three volumes, also complete in one. Covers period 1792-1878. A careful, clear, scholarly, admirably written political history of the chief Continental nations.

Andrews, C. M., *The Historical Development of Modern Europe,* 2 vols. (1896-1898). Brings the history of the chief Continental nations down to 1897. The smaller nations are not treated. The narrative is clear, informing, studiously fair. The most important chapters are perhaps those on the revolutions of 1848 and on the diplomacy of the Crimean War.

Andrews, C. M., *Contemporary Europe, Asia and Africa,* (1902). Covers excellently the period from 1871 to 1901. Forms a part of the series of *The History of All Nations.*

Phillips, W. Alison, *Modern Europe, 1815-1899.* A purely political study, limited, moreover, almost entirely to external or diplomatic history. Accurate and trustworthy within its circumscribed limits. Very weak on the period after 1878.

Robinson, J. H., and Beard, C. A., *The Development of Modern Europe,* vol. II. Emphasizes the significance of economic factors in the history of the century. Has interesting chapters on the industrial revolution, on Russia, on European expansion, and on some of the great problems of to-day.

Müller, *Political History of Recent Times.* Pronouncedly liberal point of view. Journalistic, fairly full. Comes down to about 1880.

Kirkpatrick, F. A., editor, *Lectures on the History of the Nineteenth Century.* Cambridge, 1902. Consists of seventeen lectures given by various scholars to university extension students. Particularly interesting are the lectures on Germany by Marcks, on France by Mantoux, and on Russia by Vinogradoff.

Lavisse et Rambaud, *Histoire générale du IVe siècle à nos jours.* Vols. X, XI, XII cover the period from 1815 to 1900. A co-operative history by French scholars. Articles are of varying, though on the whole, of high excellence. The narrative is generally clear and not overloaded with facts. The bibliographies are very useful.

Debidour, *Histoire diplomatique de l'Europe, 1814-1878*, 2 vols. (1891). A useful aid to the study of the period, well proportioned, well arranged and well written; on the whole impartial. Authorities are not quoted for any statements and the bibliographies at the opening of each chapter are inadequate, miscellaneous, and not critical.

Bourgeois, Émile, *Manuel historique de politique étrangère*, 3 vols. (1905); vols. II and III concern our period; come down to 1878.

There are many German histories of this period. The fullest are the volumes in Oncken's *Allgemeine Geschichte in Einzeldarstellungen;* namely Flathe, *Das Zeitalter der Restauration und Revolution (1815-1851);* Bulle, *Geschichte des zweiten Kaiserreiches und des Königreiches Italien;* Bamberg, *Geschichte der orientalischen Angelegenheit im Zeitraume des Pariser und des Berliner Friedens;* Oncken, *Das Zeitalter des Kaisers Wilhelm.* These volumes collectively cover the period from 1815 to 1888 in about four thousand pages.

Another excellent German work is Bulle, *Geschichte der neuesten Zeit*, 4 vols. (1886-1887), covering the period 1815-1885. The most scientific and authoritative history on the years succeeding 1815 is Stern, A., *Geschichte Europas seit den Verträgen von 1815 bis zum Frankfurter Frieden von 1871.* Four volumes have appeared, carrying the narrative down to about 1835. This work is indispensable to every student. It is rigidly scientific, scholarly, free from partisanship, and includes much new archival material. It is the most thorough and most informing work on the period in any language and considerably extends our knowledge. It ought to be translated.

Hertslet, *Map of Europe by Treaty since 1814*, 4 vols. (1875-1891). Contains treaties in English covering the period from 1814 to 1891, showing how the "Map of Europe" has been changed by treaties or by other international arrangements since the overthrow of Napoleon I.

Very useful are the biographical dictionaries of various countries: for Austria-Hungary; Wurzbach, *Biographisches Lexikon des Kaiserthums Oesterreich*, 60 Theile, Vienna (1856-1891); for Germany; Liliencron und Wegele, *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie*, Leipsic (1875 seq. —), now 54 volumes; for France, *Nouvelle biographie générale*, edited by Hoefer, 1855-1866, 46 vols., not limited to France; for England, Stephen and Lee, editors, *Dictionary of National Biography*, 67 vols. (1885-1903).

CHAPTER I

The Reconstruction of Europe

For Sources: See Klüber, *Akten des Wiener Kongresses;* Hertslet, *Map of Europe by Treaty*, vol. I; *British and Foreign State Papers*, vol. II, 1814-1815. The First and Second Treaties of Paris may be found in Anderson, *Constitutions and Documents*, Nos. 91 and 99; The Treaty of the Holy Alliance in *University of Pennsylvania, Translations and Reprints*, vol. I, 3; or in Robinson and Beard, *Readings in Modern European History*, vol. I, No. 183. **General Treatment of the Congress:** *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. IX, chaps. XIX and XXI; Lavisse et Rambaud, *Histoire générale*, vol. X, chap I; Debidour, *Histoire diplomatique*, vol. I, chap. I. Stern, *Geschichte Europas*, vol. I, chap. I; Sorel, *L'Europe et la Révolution française*, vol. VIII, pp. 355-505; Houssaye, H., *1814*. Oncken, *Das Zeitalter der Revolution, des Kaiserreiches und der Befreiungskriege*, vol. II, pp. 832-911; Treitschke, *Deutsche Geschichte im Neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, vol. I, pp. 597-711; Sybel, *The Founding of the German Empire*, vol. I, chap. III; Springer,

Geschichte Oesterreichs, vol. I, pp. 254-274; THAYER, *Dawn of Italian Independence,* vol. I, pp. 116-138. See also DEBIDOUR, *Études critiques sur la Révolution, l'Empire et la Période contemporaine,* which include studies on *Talleyrand au Congrès de Vienne* and *La liquidation de 1815;* see also SOREL, *Essais d'histoire et de critique,* containing a study on *Talleyrand au Congrès de Vienne.* On Second Treaty of Paris: SOREL, *L'Europe et la Révolution,* vol. VIII, pp. 467-493; SOREL, *Le Traité de Paris du 20 novembre, 1815.* On Metternich: MALLESON, *Life of Prince Metternich* (1888); MAZADE, *Un chancelier d'ancien régime; Le règne diplomatique de Metternich,* (1889); *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie,* vol. XXIII, article by BAILLEU with critical bibliography; WURZBACH, *Biographisches Lexikon des Kaiserthums Oesterreich,* Achtzehnter Theil, with extensive bibliography; SOREL, *Essais d'histoire et de critique, Metternich,* pp. 3-54; DEBIDOUR, *Études critiques sur la Révolution, etc.,* pp. 259-296. METTERNICH'S *Memoirs,* in part, have been translated into English by Mrs. NAPIER, 5 vols. For criticism of them, see: BAILLEU, *Historische Zeitschrift,* XLIV, pp. 227-277, and SOREL, *Essais d'histoire et de critique,* article cited above.

On the lighter side of Congress of Vienna, see: *Memoirs of the Prince de Ligne,* translated by Mrs. WORMELEY (1902); vol. II, pp. 261-292, containing extracts from Lagarde; see also LAGARDE, COMTE DE, *The Journal of a Nobleman, being a Narrative of His Residence at Vienna During the Congress* (1833).

CHAPTER II

REACTION IN AUSTRIA AND GERMANY

An invaluable bibliography of German history is DAHLMANN-WAITZ, *Quellenkunde der deutschen Geschichte,* 7th edition, edited by BRANDENBURG (1906-1907).

The Act of Confederation and the Carlsbad Decrees are in *University of Pennsylvania, Translations and Reprints,* vol. I, No. 3; also in ROBINSON and BEARD, *Readings in Modern European History,* vol. II. An excellent collection of speeches illustrating the history of Germany from 1808 to 1893 is FLATHE, *Deutsche Reden,* 2 vols. (1893-1894).

On Austria in 1815 and immediately after: see, STERN, *Geschichte Europas,* vol. I, chap. III; SPRINGER, *Geschichte Oesterreichs seit dem Wiener Frieden,* vol. I, 275-322. There is in English no history of Germany in the nineteenth century. One has been announced for many years by J. W. Headlam, to cover the period from 1815 to 1889, but it has not yet appeared. HENDERSON, E. F., *A Short History of Germany,* vol. II, pp. 324-450, covers in an animated fashion the years from 1815 to 1871. POULTNEY BIGELOW'S *History of the German Struggle for Liberty,* 4 vols. (1905), comes down to 1848, but has slight importance, containing too little history, and too much gossip. The author's *penchant* for the picturesque leads him far and wide at times. An admirable survey, the most satisfactory treatment of Germany covering the period of this chapter, is in STERN, *Geschichte Europas,* vol. I, chap. IV. See also KAUFMANN, *Politische Geschichte Deutschlands in Neunzehnten Jahrhundert,* pp. 73-136. SYBEL, *The Founding of the German Empire,* vol. I, pp. 52-81. The most extensive account of these years is TREITSCHKE'S *Deutsche Geschichte im Neunzehnten Jahrhundert,* vol. II, 1814-1819. Treitschke's history in five volumes comes down to 1848. It has had an immense popularity in Germany. It is based upon extensive research, is full of life and color. Treitschke was one of the great prose writers of Germany. His history, however, is a work of art and

propaganda, not of science. It is marked by unbridled chauvinism, by the frankest and most obtrusive revelation of the author's vigorous predilections and aversions. Eloquent and interesting throughout, and marked by a wealth of historical and literary learning, it is woefully lacking in impartiality and justice. Treitschke was called to the University of Berlin in 1874, in the face of the opposition of Ranke, who would not recognize him as an historian, but only as a publicist. VAN DEVENTER, M. L., *Cinquante années de l'histoire fédérale de l'Allemagne* (Brussels, 1870). A discussion of the organization and character of the Federal Constitution and an account of the history of the German Confederation from its establishment in 1815 to its dissolution in 1866.

CHAPTER III

REACTION AND REVOLUTION IN SPAIN AND ITALY

For a general account: see, BUTLER CLARKE, *Modern Spain, 1815-1898*, chaps. II and III; HUME, *Modern Spain*, chap. V; HUBBARD, *Histoire contemporaine de l'Espagne*. Vols. I and II cover the reign of Ferdinand VII, 1814-1833. On Italy, between 1815 and 1821: see, THAYER, W. R., *The Dawn of Italian Independence*, vol. I, pp. 139-311, the best account in English; also, STILLMAN, W. J., *The Unity of Italy*, pp. 1-40. On social conditions of Italy after 1815: see, BOLTON KING, *A History of Italian Unity*, vol. I, chaps. III, IV, V. On the rise and activity of the secret societies, JOHNSTON, R. M., *The Napoleonic Empire in Southern Italy*, vol. II, pp. 1-139. The most important treatment of the whole subject of the conditions in Spain and Italy, the revolutions and the congresses, is in STERN, *Geschichte Europas*, vol. II, chaps. I, III-VI, VIII-X. *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. X, chaps. I, IV, VII, may be consulted. Also TREITSCHKE, *Deutsche Geschichte*, vol. III, pp. 131-191, 254-283; DEBIDOUR, *L'histoire diplomatique*, chaps. III-V. On England's foreign policy from 1815 to 1827: WALPOLE, *History of England since 1815*, vol. III, chap. X; BRODRICK and FOTHERINGHAM, *History of England, 1801-1837*, chap. X; PAXSON, F. L., *The Independence of the South American Republics*, an excellent account of the wars of liberation and a study of the policies of England and the United States. On the Monroe Doctrine: REDDAWAY, W. F., *The Monroe Doctrine* (1898), or TURNER, F. J., *Rise of the New West* (1906), chap. XII; TEMPERLEY, H. W. V., *Life of Canning* (1905).

CHAPTER IV

FRANCE DURING THE RESTORATION

For sources: see, ANDERSON, *Constitutions and Documents*, No. 93, Constitutional Charter of 1814; No. 101, various press laws. On the crisis and revolution of 1830, *Ibid*, Nos. 103 and 104, also: ROBINSON and BEARD, *Readings in Modern European History*, vol. II, Nos. 185-190. A very well chosen selection of extracts from the political speeches of this period, which was one of high distinction in parliamentary oratory, is found in CHABRIER, ALBERT, *Les orateurs politiques de la France* (1902); pp. 389-554 cover the period 1815-1830. For speeches, *in extenso*, one must consult *Le Moniteur* or *Les archives parlementaires*, edited by MAVIDAL et LAURENT, second series. An index volume facilitates the use of this indispensable but very elaborate work.

There is no satisfactory history of France during the nineteenth

century. Lebon, *Modern France*, 1789-1895 (Story of the Nations Series, 1898), is a brief, frequently inaccurate outline by an active politician. Coubertin, *France since 1814* (1890), is a brief, popular, unscholarly account. W. G. Berry, *France since Waterloo* (1909), more satisfactory than the preceding, is readable and useful. A very suggestive little book is G. Lowes Dickinson, *Revolution and Reaction in Modern France* (1892), not a history of France, but a description of the various phases and schools of political thought from 1789 to 1871.

On the period of this chapter, 1815 to 1830, there are chapters in the *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. X, chaps. II and III, and Lavisse et Rambaud, *Histoire générale*, vol. X, chaps. III, VII, XI, XII, XIII. The most thorough and scholarly treatment is in Stern, *Geschichte Europas*, vol. I, chaps. I, VI; vol. II, chaps. VIII, X, XI; vol. III, chap. X; vol. IV, chap. I. See also J. R. Hall, *The Bourbon Restoration* (1909).

The French works Viel Castel, *Histoire de la Restauration*, in 20 vols. (1860-1878), and Duvergier de Hauranne, *Histoire du Gouvernement parlementaire en France, 1814-1830*, 10 vols., may be consulted as works of reference but are much too extensive and too unscientific for general use. Viviani's volume in Jaurès's *Histoire Socialiste*, vol. VII, *La Restauration, 1814-1830*, is brilliantly written, abounds in criticism but is marked by a total absence of references to authorities and is one-sided; useful, however, for the study of social and labor questions and conditions.

There are a number of important monographs on aspects of this history: Pierre Simon's *L'élaboration de la charte constitutionnelle de 1814*, 184 pp. (1906), a valuable study containing a description of the sources used, a narrative of the events of the two months, April and May, 1814, which bore upon the framing of the charter, and a critical study of the text—of the origin of its general principles and its particular provisions. Pierre Rain, *L'Europe et la Restauration des Bourbons* (1908, 493 pp.), is a scholarly investigation of the first years of the Restauration, 1814-1818, and an important addition to our knowledge of the supervision which the Allies exercised over the French government during the years of military occupation, 1815-1818. Henry Houssaye, *1815, La Seconde Abdication, La Terreur blanche*, is a graphic and on the whole sound description of an unfortunate and turbulent year of transition, far superior to E. Daudet's *La Terreur blanche*. L. Michon, *Le Gouvernement parlementaire sous la Restauration* (1905, 471 pp.), is a solid study, partly historical, partly juristic, of the introduction and establishment of the theory and practice of cabinet and parliamentary government in France under Louis XVIII and Charles X. J. Barthélemy, *L'Introduction du régime parlementaire en France sous Louis XVIII et Charles X* (1904, 323 pp.), is another valuable study of the same subject, a work crowned by the Faculty of Law of Paris. Thureau-Dangin, *Le parti libéral sous la Restauration* (1876), a study of the "Opposition" from 1815 to 1830, useful for an understanding of the July Revolution. On the history of the republican party during this period: see, G. Weill, *Histoire du parti républicain en France de 1814 à 1870* (1900), pp. 1-32. On questions of church and state and the activity of the clerical party see, Debidour, *L'Église et l'État en France de 1789-1870*, pp. 325-412, a valuable contribution to modern church history, readable, analytical, supplied with footnotes and appendices. A special topic, fully treated, is *Les royalistes contre l'armée, 1815-1820*, by Édouard Bonnal, Paris, (1906), 2 vols. Useful books on this and succeeding periods of French history are: Duguit (Léon) et Monnier (Henry), *Les constitutions et les principales lois politiques de la France depuis 1789*, based upon

official texts and containing an analytical index (1898); Hélie, F. A., *Les constitutions de la France* (1880), contains the texts of the various constitutions and historical notes. É. Pierre, *Histoire des assemblées politiques en France* (1877), covering the years 1789 to 1831, and G. D. Weil, *Les élections législatives depuis 1789* (1895), are useful. Much information, in clear and compact form, on constitutions, electoral laws, liberties, finances, army, navy, education, letters, sciences, and arts, may be found in Rambaud, *Histoire de la civilisation contemporaine en France* (Paris, 1888, 2 vols.); vol. II, 320-724, covers the period from 1814 to 1888.

CHAPTER V

Revolutions Beyond France

Much the most scholarly and authoritative treatment of the revolutionary movements in the Netherlands, Poland, Italy, and Germany, is Stern, *Geschichte Europas,* vol. IV, chaps. II-VI. The *Cambridge Modern History,* vol. X, and Lavisse et Rambaud, *Histoire générale,* vol. X, have sections on the subjects treated in this chapter; also Debidour, *L'histoire diplomatique,* vol. I, chaps. VII-IX. On Poland, 1815-1830: consult, Schiemann, *Geschichte Russlands unter Nikolaus I,* vol. I, chaps. V, VI; vol. II, chap. XII; also Skrine, *Expansion of Russia,* pp. 110-122. The movements in Germany are described in Treitschke, *Deutsche Geschichte,* vol. IV, chap. II; in Kaufmann, *Politische Geschichte Deutschlands,* pp. 170-193; in Sybel, *The Founding of the German Empire,* vol. I, pp. 82-107. For events in Italy: consult, Thayer, *Dawn of Italian Independence,* vol. I, pp. 342-378.

CHAPTER VI

Reign of Louis Philippe

For sources: see, Anderson, *Constitutions and Documents,* No. 105, the constitution of 1830, and No. 106, the electoral law of 1831; Robinson and Beard, *Readings in Modern European History,* vol. II, No. 213, Louis Blanc's labor programme. Illustrative extracts from parliamentary speeches are in Pellisson, *Les orateurs politiques de la France de 1830 à nos jours* (1898), pp. 1-208. The most extensive French history on the reign of Louis Philippe is that by Thureau-Dangin, *Histoire de la monarchie de juillet,* 7 vols. (1884-1892). Very different in interpretation and emphasis is Fournière's *Le règne de Louis Philippe* (Jaurès, *Histoire Socialiste,* vol. VIII). Hillebrand, *Geschichte Frankreichs 1830-1848,* 2 vols. (1877-1879), is a work of value. Louis Blanc's *Histoire de dix ans* (1830-1840), 5 vols., is important for the radical movements of the time. See also, Stein, L., *Geschichte der socialen Bewegung in Frankreich,* 3 vols. (1850). Covers years 1789 to 1849. An admirable treatment of the first five years of the reign is found in Stern, *Geschichte Europas,* vol. IV, chaps. I and XII. A favorable view of the policy of Louis Philippe is given by Professor Bourgeois in *Cambridge Modern History,* vol. X, chap. XV, and vol. XI, chap II.

On the history of the Republicans: Weill, *Histoire du parti républicain.* pp. 33-275, a careful study based upon a large number of pamphlets, memoirs, and newspapers, and containing an excellent bibliography and index. I. Tchernoff, *Le parti républicain sous la*

monarchie de juillet (1901), shows that the doctrines of the republicans were changing under the stress of new and imperative needs and were not a mere repetition of revolutionary phrases. Carefully documented. Octave Festy's *Le mouvement ouvrier au début de la monarchie de juillet*, 2 vols. (1908), covers the years 1830-1834, and is an important monograph tracing the growth of labor organizations and the development of the ideas and programmes of the working class. Debidour, *L'Église et l'État en France*, pp. 413-480, describes the relation of the church and state during the reign. Debidour, *Études critiques sur la Révolution*, etc., has essays on *Louis Philippe émigré* and *Metternich et le gouvernement de juillet*. A. Bardoux, *Guizot* (1894), is a criticism of Guizot as statesman, historian, political orator, critic, and publicist. Other biographies are J. de Crozals, *Guizot;* I. Tchernoff, *Louis Blanc* (1904); E. Zevort, *Thiers* (1892); de Mazade, *Thiers, Cinquante années d'histoire contemporaine* (1884); and Jules Simon, *Thiers, Guizot, Rémusat* (1885).

CHAPTER VII

Central Europe Between Two Revolutions

For Prussia during this period there is no good history in English. Sybel covers these years briefly in *The Founding of the German Empire*, vol. I, pp. 82-141. The fullest treatment in German is that of Treitschke, *Deutsche Geschichte;* among the important subjects treated are the Zollverein, vol. IV, pp. 350-406; railroads and telegraphs, vol. IV, pp. 581-598; accession and early reign of Frederick William IV, vol. V, pp. 3-60; on dissatisfaction with the reign and general confusion, vol. V, pp. 138-275; on economic conditions, vol. V, pp. 433-523; on the United Landtag of 1847, vol. V, pp. 591-648. Kaufmann, *Politische Geschichte*, covers this period, pp. 193-218; 273-304. On the Zollverein: see also, B. Rand, *Economic History*, chap. VIII; also W. H. Dawson, *Protection in Germany* (1904), chaps. I and II, the best book in English on German commercial policy, and coming down to the tariff of 1902.

On Austria: see, Springer, *Geschichte Oesterreichs seit dem Wiener Frieden*, Zweiter Theil, pp. 1-134; Leger, L., *A History of Austro-Hungary from the earliest Time to the Year 1889*. Translated by Mrs. B. Hill (1889), chaps. XXVII-XXIX; Whitman, S., *Austria* (Story of the Nations Series), chaps. XXII-XXIII. On Hungary: Eisenmann, L., *Le Compromis Austro-Hongrois de 1867 Étude sur le dualisme* (1904), pp. 1-71, contains an excellent survey of the old régime in Hungary, a description of the Hungarian constitution and the relations of Hungary to the Austrian monarchy, and an account of the awakening of the new ideas and the preparation for revolution; a very valuable monograph, containing a bibliography of the source and secondary material. Florence Arnold Forster, *Deák, A Memoir*, first published anonymously in 1880 with a preface by M. E. Grant Duff, is a very useful biography. On Bohemia: E. Denis, *La Bohême depuis la Montagne-Blanche*, 2 vols. (1903). Vol. II, 675 pp., constitutes probably the best history of Bohemia from 1815 to 1901, detailed and full. Pages 87-231 cover the years 1815 to 1848. Some of the subjects treated are the Czech renaissance, literature, science, the Metternich régime, the growth of the spirit of nationality, the years 1848-1849.

For Italy: Thayer, W. R., *The Dawn of Italian Independence*, vol. I, pp. 379-453; vol. II, pp. 1-76; also the various histories cited above by King, Stillman, Cesaresco, Probyn. L. C. Farini, *The Roman State from 1815-1850*, translated by W. E. Gladstone, 4 vols. (1852).

Farini was a Liberal politician opposed to Clericals and Republicans, and generally well informed. R. M. Johnston, *The Roman Theocracy and the Republic, 1846-1849,* pp. 1-112, on the election and early years of the pontificate of Pius IX. Bulle, O., *Die italienische Einheitsidee in ihrer literarischen Entwicklung von Parini bis Manzoni* (Berlin, 1893). A valuable monograph on the early presentation of the ideal of national unity as contained in the writings of Parini and Alfieri, on the intellectual movement during the Revolutionary and Napoleonic period, mirrored in the works of Monti and Foscolo, and on the patriotic significance of Manzoni's productions. Important as showing the pre-Mazzinian development of the idea of unity. The best biography of Mazzini is that by Bolton King, *Joseph Mazzini* (1902). Pages 1-221 are devoted to a chronological account of Mazzini's life, 222-341 mainly to a presentation of his principal teachings. Includes a bibliography. Myers, F. W. H., *Essays—Modern;* contains an excellent study of Mazzini's life. Some of the works of Mazzini have been translated into English and published in six volumes under the title, *Life and Writings of Joseph Mazzini* (1890-1891). A small collection of *Essays by Joseph Mazzini* has been made by Thomas Okey (1894). There is now being published in Italy a complete collection of Mazzini's writings, *Scritti editi ed inediti di Giuseppe Mazzini.* This will probably number sixty volumes when completed, will include the vast correspondence of Mazzini, and will inevitably constitute the most important source for the history of Italy during the awakening. There is an interesting essay on Mazzini in W. R. Thayer's *Italica* (1908), and brief popular sketches may be found in J. A. R. Marriott's *Makers of Modern Italy,* and in R. S. Holland's *Builders of United Italy* (1908).

CHAPTER VIII

Central Europe in Revolt

Excellent general accounts of the revolutions of 1848-1849 are to be found in Fyffe, *History of Modern Europe,* single volume edition, pp. 707-804, three volume edition, vol. III, pp. 1-148; and in Andrews, *Historical Development of Modern Europe,* vol. I, chaps. IX and X. Maurice, C. E., *The Revolutionary Movement of 1848-1849, in Italy, Austria-Hungary, and Germany, with some Examination of the Previous Thirty-three Years* (1887), contains a great amount of information, poorly presented; also contains a bibliography.

For Austria, the chief authorities are Friedjung, H., *Oesterreich von 1848 bis 1860.* Vol. I covers the period from 1848 to 1851 (1908); Springer, *Geschichte Oesterreichs,* Zweiter Theil, pp. 135-774; Helfert, J. A., *Geschichte Oesterreichs seit 1848.* For Hungary, the most important treatment is Eisenmann, *Le Compromis Austro-Hongrois,* pp. 75-148. Consult, also Arnold Forster, *Deák, A Memoir,* pp. 72-112. Kossuth's *Speeches in America,* explaining and defending the Hungarian movement, were edited by F. W. Newman and published in New York in 1854. For Bohemia: Denis, *La Bohême depuis la Montagne-Blanche* (1903), vol. II, pp. 235-381.

For Germany: see, Sybel, *The Founding of the German Empire,* vol. I, pp. 145-492; vol. II, pp. 3-82; Kaufmann, *Politische Geschichte Deutschlands,* chap. V; Matter, P., *La Prusse et la Révolution de 1848* (1903). The best account of the German revolution is in Hans Blum's *Die deutsche Revolution, 1848-49* (1897). A sketch of the attempts to achieve unity before 1848, followed by an account of the revolutionary movements in the several states and of the work of the

Frankfort Parliament. Bismarck's opinions on the revolutionary events are in his *Reflections and Reminiscences,* vol. I, chaps. II and III. Vol. I of the *Reminiscences of Carl Schurz* (1907), a revolutionist and refugee, are exceedingly interesting on these years.

For Italy, by far the best account in English is THAYER, *Dawn of Italian Independence,* vol. II, pp. 77-415. On the French expedition against the Roman Republic: see, BOURGEOIS et CLERMONT, *Rome et Napoléon III;* also the recent scholarly and very graphic book of G. M. TREVELYAN on *Garibaldi's Defence of the Roman Republic* (1907). Chapters I, II, and III give an admirable account of Garibaldi's previous career, and chaps. XII-XVII a description of his famous retreat. An excellent bibliography is appended. Garibaldi's own account is contained in his *Autobiography,* translated by A. WERNER, vol. II, pp. 1-51. On Mazzini's connection with the Republic: see, BOLTON KING'S *Life of Mazzini,* chap. VII. R. M. JOHNSTON, *Roman Theocracy,* pp. 113-315, may also be consulted on the years 1848-1849.

CHAPTER IX

THE SECOND REPUBLIC AND THE FOUNDING OF THE SECOND EMPIRE

The Constitution of 1848 may be found in ANDERSON, *Constitutions and Documents,* No. 110. There are clear accounts of the Second Republic, by BOURGEOIS, in *Cambridge Modern History,* vol. XI, chap. V, and by SEIGNOBOS in LAVISSE et RAMBAUD, *Histoire générale,* vol. XI, chap. I. General histories are: PIERRE, V., *Histoire de la république de 1848, 2* vols. (1873-1878), anti-Bonapartist; GORCE, *Histoire de la deuxième république, 2* vols. (1887), written from the standpoint of sympathy with a liberal monarchy, critical of the republic, and merciless toward socialists and socialistic theories. An admirable counterweight to this is GEORGES RENARD'S *La république de 1848 (1848-1852),* vol. IX of *Histoire Socialiste.* Part I, pp. 1-227, is devoted to the political history, Part II, pp. 227-384, to the economic and social evolution. Important for the period are: DEBIDOUR, *L'Église et l'État en France,* pp. 481-523 on the expedition to Rome and the Falloux law concerning education; BOURGEOIS et CLERMONT, *Rome et Napoléon III,* a study in diplomacy, based upon unpublished official documents as well as upon published material, and showing that the Roman expedition of 1849 prepared the Empire by forming a close alliance between Louis Napoleon, the clergy, and the army; QUENTIN-BAUCHART, P., *Lamartine, homme politique, 2* vols. (1903-1908). Excellent recent studies are: FERDINAND DREYFUS, *L'assistance sous la deuxième république* (1907), 220 pp., a treatment of the question of poverty and an account of the various measures of social reform passed at this time; WEILL, G., *Histoire du parti républicain en France,* chaps. IX and X; I. TCHERNOFF, *Associations et sociétés secrètes sous la deuxième république, 1848-1851* (1905), 396 pp., a treatise based upon much unpublished material in the archives of the ministries of justice and the interior; aims to show that the *coup d'état* was prepared by the previous systematic destruction of republican organizations; a collection of valuable documents; I. TCHERNOFF, *Le parti républicain au Coup d'État et sous le Second Empire* (1906), 676 pp., richly documented, shows that the *coup d'état* was far from being received by the laboring classes with amiable indifference; I. TCHERNOFF, *Louis Blanc,* 1904; TÉNOT, E., *The Coup d'État;* THIRRIA, *Napoléon III avant l'Empire, 2* vols., is an apology for the Prince President, diffuse, useful as showing the state of public opinion, as the author has industriously ransacked English and French newspaper files; CHEETHAM, F. H., *Louis*

Napoleon and the Genesis of the Second Republic; being a Life of the Emperor Napoleon III to the Time of His Election to the Presidency of the French Republic (1909), is a popular, readable narrative, but adds nothing to our knowledge; JERROLD, *The Life of Napoleon III, Derived from State Records, from Unpublished Family Correspondence, and from Personal Testimony,* 4 vols. (1871-1874), is sympathetic and full; FORBES, A., *Life of Napoleon III,* is popular, superficial, untrustworthy; H. A. L. FISHER, *Bonapartism, Six Lectures Delivered in the University of London* (1908), is popular and brilliantly written, attempts to show the essential unity of the two Napoleonic régimes, more interesting and suggestive than convincing; PELLISSON, *Les orateurs politiques,* pp. 209-277, contains interesting extracts from parliamentary speeches.

For the Second Empire, the leading secondary authority is GORCE, *Histoire du Second Empire,* 7 vols. (1894-1905), the fullest and ablest history we have of the period from 1850 to 1871, very important, not only for the history of France, but of Italy and Germany also. Presents a wealth of information with great ludicity, admirable impartiality, and largeness of view. An indispensable work. Vols. I, pp. 1-131, and II, pp. 1-129, cover the field of this chapter. TAXILE DELORD, *Histoire du Second Empire,* 6 vols. (1869-1875), an older work, based on careful research, strongly opposed to the Empire. ALBERT THOMAS, *Le Second Empire (Histoire Socialiste,* vol. X), very instructive; see chaps. I and II. There is no satisfactory account of the Second Empire in English. Chapters I and IV in vol. II of ANDREWS, *Historical Development of Modern Europe,* are clear and well-balanced, but necessarily restricted. See, also, *Cambridge Modern History,* vol. XI, chap. X. For the history of the relations of church and state: see, DEBIDOUR, *L'Église et l'État en France,* pp. 524-550; for history of the republican party: WEILL, *Histoire du parti républicain,* chaps. XI-XIII; I. TCHERNOFF, *Le parti républicain au Coup d'État et sous le Second Empire;* for description of the political system of the autocratic Empire: see, BERTON, *L'évolution constitutionelle du Second Empire.* Part I treats of the despotic empire and the constitution of 1852. A very important monograph. For labor and social questions and movements: WEILL, G., *Histoire du mouvement social en France, 1852-1902* (1905), chaps. I-III.

CHAPTER X

CAVOUR AND THE CREATION OF THE KINGDOM OF ITALY

The general histories of Italy on this period are: KING, *A History of Italian Unity,* 2 vols., the most extensive and informing history in English, thoroughly documented. Vol. I, pp. 353-416, and all of vol. II concern the period of this chapter; CESARESCO, *The Liberation of Italy,* pp. 165-415, written with much charm, sympathy, and understanding, but without scientific apparatus; STILLMAN, *The Union of Italy,* pp. 242-325; PROBYN, *Italy 1815-1890,* pp. 159-242. There is an excellent chapter in WALPOLE'S *History of Twenty-five Years,* vol. I, pp. 206-308. Much the best account of Napoleon III's Italian policy and of the war of 1859 is in GORCE, *Histoire du Second Empire,* vol. II, pp. 211-449, and vol. III, pp. 1-123; and on the annexations, *Ibid.* vol. III, pp. 125-212, a treatment marked by admirable lucidity, keenness of analysis, solidity of judgment, and sustained interest of narration. For Cavour: see, CESARESCO, *Cavour* (1898), a brief biography of unusual merits, well-informed, just to the other figures of the time as well as to Cavour, epigrammatic, full of color and life. Countess Cesaresco traces

the shifting diplomacy of the period with precision and comprehension. Her chapters on the internal reforms in Piedmont and her revelation of Cavour's activity between the interview of Plombières and April 1859 are admirable. William de la Rive, *Le Comte de Cavour, Récits et Souvenirs* (Paris, 1862), an intimate portrait by a close personal friend. This has been translated into English by Edward Romilly (London, 1862), but the French edition is preferable. D. Berti, *Il Conte di Cavour avanti il 1848* (1886), important. Villari in his *Studies, Critical and Historical* (London, 1907), has a chapter on the youth of Cavour (pp. 119-141). D. Zanichelli, *Cavour* (1905), a solid study by a professor in the University of Pisa. N. Bianchi, *La politique du Comte Camille de Cavour de 1852 à 1861, Lettres inédites,* 419 pp. (1885), is an important collection of over two hundred letters of Cavour to Marquis Emmanuel d'Azeglio, the ambassador of Piedmont to England during the period. Treitschke, *Cavour,* in vol. III of his *Historische und Politische Aufsätze,* a study first published in 1869, and Kraus, F. X., *Cavour, Die Erhebung Italiens im Neunzehnten Jahrhundert,* with bibliography and illustrations (1902), may also be consulted; see, also, Mazade, *Le Comte de Cavour* (1877). The parliamentary speeches of Cavour have been published in 12 vols., *Discorsi parlementari* (1863-1874), and Chiala, L., has edited his correspondence, *Lettere edite ed inedite di Camillo Cavour,* 2nd edit. (1883-1887), 10 vols. Chiala's extensive introductions and notes in these volumes are of great value. See, also, Bert, A., *Nouvelles lettres inédites de Cavour* (1889). Brief essays on Cavour are found in Marriott's *Makers of Modern Italy,* and in Holland's *Builders of United Italy.* Lord Acton has a suggestive essay on Cavour, first published in 1861, and reprinted in 1907, in his *Historical Essays and Studies,* chap. VI. W. R. Thayer compares Cavour and Bismarck in the *Atlantic Monthly,* March 1909; same article *Fortnightly Review,* March and April 1909. Nigra, *Cavour and Madame de Circourt* (1894), contains some unpublished letters from the years 1836-1860. Cadogan's *Life of Cavour* is worthless.

On Garibaldi the most recent work is G. M. Trevelyan, *Garibaldi and the Thousand* (1909), an account of the Sicilian expedition. Another volume is announced by the same author to cover the conquest of the mainland. These, with the work already cited by the same author on *Garibaldi's Defence of the Roman Republic,* will constitute the most scholarly account, in English, of Garibaldi's career. Their literary merit is high. Each volume contains a critical bibliography. W. R. Thayer's *Throne Makers* (1899), has a spirited essay on Garibaldi. H. R. Whitehouse, *Collapse of the Kingdom of Naples* (1899), gives a brief survey of affairs in Naples down to 1848, describes the reaction of the years 1850-1859, and then the catastrophe of 1860; an excellent book.

On the Papacy: see, R. de Cesare, *The Last Days of Papal Rome (1850-1870),* translated by Helen Zimmern, with an introduction by G. M. Trevelyan (Boston, 1909). *The Birth of Modern Italy* (1909) consists of the posthumous papers of Jessie White Mario, edited by the Duke Litta-Visconti-Arese; interesting for the careers of Mazzini and Garibaldi whose friend Madame Mario was; unjust toward Cavour; full of the emotion of the Risorgimento—at least of the republican agitation. Della Rocca, *The Autobiography of a Veteran* (1898), is an interesting narrative by an important participant in events from 1848 to 1870.

The most elaborate Italian histories of the Risorgimento are: Tivaroni, C., *Storia critica del risorgimento d'Italia* (Turin, 1888-1897), 9 vols.; and, Bersezio, V., *Il regno di Vittorio Emanuele II; Trent' anni di vita italiana* (Turin, 1878-1895), 8 vols.

CHAPTER XI

Bismarck and German Unity

There is no satisfactory work in English on the founding of the German Empire. Headlam's long-promised work in the *Cambridge Historical Series* has not yet appeared. Malleson's *The Refounding of the German Empire 1848-1871* (1893) is brief and concerned chiefly with military events. The articles in the *Cambridge Modern History* are unsatisfactory. Walpole, *History of Twenty-Five Years,* vol. II, chaps. X and XIII, is straightforward, informing, concerned mainly with diplomacy. Sybel's *The Founding of the German Empire by William I,* 7 vols. (1890-1898), is a monumental work, based chiefly upon Prussian state documents, to which he alone was allowed access by Bismarck. While a work of remarkable industry and erudition, it is a thoroughgoing defense and panegyric of the conduct of the Prussian Government. Moreover, in many important matters it is not subject to effective control. Zwiedeneck-Südenhorst's *Deutsche Geschichte von der Auflösung des alten bis zur Errichtung des neuen Kaiserreichs, 1806-1871,* 3 vols. (1905), is characterized by much the same partisanship, as is also Ottokar Lorenz's *Kaiser Wilhelm und die Begründung des Reichs, 1866-1871* (Jena, 1902). On the other hand, the German scholarship, which commands greater respect abroad as more critical and objective, is that of Marcks, Lenz, Delbrück, Meinecke, who are adhering to the Ranke traditions of historical writing. H. Friedjung's *Der Kampf um die Vorherrschaft in Deutschland,* is by an Austrian scholar and covers the years 1859-1866, 2 vols. (1898). It is the most important treatment we have of the relations of Prussia and Austria on the critical years before 1866. Contains also an excellent account of the Austro-Prussian war. The work is already in its seventh edition. One of the most brilliant and suggestive books on this period is by E. Denis, *La fondation de l'empire allemand* (1906), a study covering the years 1850 to 1870, limited to a single series of facts, those which prepared and which explain the foundation of the German Empire. Large space is given to the evolution of ideas and to the economic transformation. The book is marked by profound and wide investigation, by penetration and subtlety of characterization, by an admirable impartiality. It contains no references, footnotes, or bibliography.

The literature on Bismarck is very extensive and is constantly expanding. His speeches have been published by Kohl, *Die politischen Reden des Fürsten Bismarck,* 14 vols. (1892-1905). There is an excellent selection in two small volumes, sold cheaply, entitled, *Otto von Bismarck, Setzen wir Deutschland in den Sattel, Reden aus der grossen Zeit,* edited by Eugen Kalkschmidt (1907). A smaller collection is that of Otto Lyon, *Bismarcks Reden und Briefe* (Leipsic, 1895). Professor Hermann Schoenfeld has published a collection entitled *Bismarck's Speeches and Letters* (in German, 1905). *The Correspondence of William I and Bismarck, with Other Letters from and to Prince Bismarck,* translated by J. A. Ford, 2 vols. (1903), consists of about five hundred letters, selected by Bismarck himself, to show his relationship to the Emperor and also to authenticate and supplement his *Reminiscences* in certain respects. *Prince Bismarck's Letters to His Wife, His Sister and Others, from 1844 to 1870,* translated by F. Maxse (New York, 1878), are vivacious and entertaining.

Bismarck's *Reflections and Reminiscences,* 2 vols. (1899), are important but must be used with caution. For criticism of them, see, Erich Marcks, *Fürst Bismarcks Gedanken und Erinnerungen. Versuch einer kritischen Würdigung* (1899); also Max Lenz, *Zur Kritik der*

Gedanken und Erinnerungen des Fürsten Bismarck (1899); Friedrich Meinecke, *Historische Zeitschrift,* Band 82, pp. 282-295; Sorel, *Études de littérature et d'histoire* (1901). On the new Bismarck historiography (writings of Busch, Blume, Bamberger, etc.), see, Hans Delbrück, *Preussische Jahrbücher,* Band 96, pp. 461-480 (June, 1899). There are many biographies of Bismarck. The best in English is that by Headlam, J. W., well informed and judicial. Munroe Smith, *Bismarck and German Unity* (1898), is a clear epitome, with a slight bibliography. In French, P. Matter, *Bismarck et son temps,* 3 vols. (1905-1908), full, critical, remarkably impartial, and very readable. In German, Max Lenz, *Geschichte Bismarcks* (1902), compact and critical; Erich Marcks, *Bismarck, Eine Biographie.* One volume has just appeared (1909), entitled *Bismarcks Jugend, 1815-1848.* One may hazard the conjecture that this, when completed, will be the most satisfactory biography in German. Ed. Heyck, *Bismarck* in *Monographien zur Weltgeschichte,* is interestingly illustrated. Erich Marcks' *Kaiser Wilhelm I* (5th edition, 1905) is admirable in knowledge, criticism, and temper, an indispensable book both by reason of its presentation and interpretation of the Emperor's career and his relations to others, especially to Bismarck, and also because of its critical bibliography.

A clear account of the Danish and Austro-Prussian wars may be found in Murdock, *The Reconstruction of Europe* (1894), chaps. XV-XXI. Hozier, H. M., *Seven Weeks' War,* is readable, founded on letters written from Bohemia to the London *Times,* well supplied with maps and plans. Sybel's account of the war of 1866 is in vol. V, *The Founding of the German Empire.* See, also, Friedjung, *Der Kampf um die Vorherrschaft,* vols. I-II, and Gorce. *Histoire du Second Empire,* vol. IV, pp. 522-631; vol. V, pp. 1-80.

CHAPTER XII

The Transformation of the Second Empire

The most valuable account of the transformation of the Second Empire between 1860 and 1870 is in Gorce, *Histoire du Second Empire,* vol. III, livre XXII, and vols. IV and V. Berton, H., *L'évolution constitutionelle du Second Empire* (1900), parts two and three, is also full and trustworthy; an important monograph by a French lawyer. For the growth of the republican party: Weill, *Histoire du parti républicain,* chaps. XII-XV; Tchernoff, *Le parti républicain au Coup d'État et sous le Second Empire.* For labor movements: Weill, *Histoire du mouvement social,* chaps. III-VI; for relations with the church: Debidour, *L'Église et l'État en France,* pp. 551-627.

CHAPTER XIII

The Franco-German War

Palat, *Bibliographie générale de la guerre de 1870-1871* (1896), is indispensable for any detailed study of this period. There is a good account of the causes of the war in Rose, *Development of European Nations,* vol. I, chap. I; also in Walpole, *History of Twenty-five Years,* vol. II, chap. VIII; Headlam, *Bismarck,* chap. XIII. Vols. VI and VII of Sybel's *Founding of the German Empire* contain an elaborate account of the events and diplomacy of the period; pronounced special pleading. These volumes have not the value of the earlier ones,

as Bismarck did not allow the author access to the Prussian archives for the period after 1867. The seventh volume was composed under the inspiration of Bismarck himself, and is based on information largely furnished by him. Delbrück says it is "not history but diplomacy—and calculated to inspire laughter at that." (Delbrück, *Das Geheimniss der Napoleonischen Politik,* p. 34). Bismarck's description is in his *Reflections and Reminiscences,* chaps. XX-XXIII. Far the most judicial, as well as most interesting account of the causes of the war and of the war itself (down to Sedan) is in Gorce's *Histoire du Second Empire,* vols. VI and VII, volumes of absorbing interest, clear, vivid, admirably arranged, and written with scrupulous fairness. Two hundred pages of vol. VI are given to the Hohenzollern candidacy. An earlier but very able study is Sorel, A., *Histoire diplomatique de la guerre franco-allemande,* 2 vols. (1875). Ollivier's *L'Empire libéral,* 14 vols., in course of publication (1895 —), is an elaborate account of the Empire by one who was badly compromised by the war. On the bearing upon the fall of the Empire of Napoleon's relations to the Pope: Bourgeois et Clermont, *Rome et Napoléon III,* is important. The authors thesis is that Napoleon's refusal to withdraw his troops from Rome occasioned the failure of the projected triple alliance with Italy and Austria, and that that was the cause of the subsequent disasters. See, also, Debidour, *L'Église et l'État en France,* pp. 551-627. Debidour's account of the diplomacy of the period is found in his *Histoire diplomatique,* vol. II, chaps. VII-X. The numerous biographies of Bismarck, cited above, should be consulted; also Marcks, *Kaiser Wilhelm I.* Lord Acton has a study of the causes of the Franco-Prussian war in his *Historical Essays and Studies* (1907), chap. VII.

Of the war itself there is a good account in Rose, *Development of the European Nations,* vol. I, chaps. II, III, and IV; also in Murdock, *Reconstruction of Europe,* chaps. XXIII-XXX. Gen. J. F. Maurice, *The Franco-German War,* is a translation of a German work, edited by Pflugk-Hartung, entitled *Krieg und Sieg* (1896); Col. L. Hale's *The People's War in France* (1904) is founded on Hönig, *Der Volkskrieg an der Loire,* and describes the latter part of the war, after Sedan. Moltke, *The Franco-German War* is important but technical. Chuquet, *La guerre de 1870-1871* (1895), is an excellent account in a single volume. The extensive histories by the German General Staff and by Lehautcourt are too detailed and technical for general use. Probably the best account for the general reader is Gorce, *Histoire du Second Empire,* vol. VI, pp. 321-434, and VII throughout (comes down to September 4, 1870). E. B. Washburne, *Recollections of a Minister to France,* 2 vols. (1887), a very interesting and important book by the United States Minister to France, the only foreign minister who remained at his post in Paris throughout the Franco-German war, and whose firm conduct won the praise of William I, Bismarck, Gambetta, and Thiers. There was published by the Government Printing Office, 1878, Senate Executive Document No. 24, a book of 222 pages entitled *Franco-German War and the Insurrection of the Commune. Correspondence of E. B. Washburne.* This includes the correspondence of Washburne with the State Department in Washington in relation to the war, together with correspondence with Bismarck, Bancroft, United States Minister to Berlin, and Motley, United States Minister to London. The letters cover the period from July 19, 1870, to June 29, 1871. Interesting volumes are Busch, *Bismarck in the Franco-German War;* A. Forbes, *My Experiences in the War Between France and Germany* (1872); W. H. Russell, *My Diary During the Last Great War* (1874); *Bismarck's Letters to His Wife from the Seat of War (1870-1871),* trans-

lated by A. Harder (1903); *Diaries of Emperor Frederick, During the Campaigns of 1866 and 1870-1871,* translated by F. A. Welby (1902); Henry Labouchere, *Diary of the Besieged Resident in Paris* (1871); Sir Edwin Arnold, *Inside Paris During the Siege* (1871); Jules Claretie, *Paris assiégé;* F. Sarcey, *Le siège de Paris.* This attained its thirtieth edition within its first year. See, Thiers, *Notes et Souvenirs,* on the years 1870-1873 (1903), for an account of Thiers' attempts to secure the intervention of foreign powers.

CHAPTER XIV

The German Empire

There is in English no general history of Germany since 1871. The treatment in Andrews, *Contemporary Europe, Asia and Africa,* is excellent. That in Rose, *Development of European Nations,* vol. I, chap. VI; and vol. II, chap. I, is slight; that in Headlam, *Bismarck,* pp. 377-463, good. Lowell, A. L., *Governments and Parties in Continental Europe,* vol. II, chap. VII, gives a clear outline of party history from 1871 to 1894. The most extensive account is H. Blum, *Das deutsche Reich zur Zeit Bismarcks,* covering the years 1871-1890 (1893), a book largely inspired by Bismarck himself. Oncken's *Das Zeitalter des Kaisers Wilhelm I,* vol. II, pp. 369-768, 952-1005, comes down to 1888. Bulle, *Geschichte der Jahre 1871-1877,* is useful. Kaufmann, *Politische Geschichte Deutschlands,* covers the period from 1870-1888 very poorly. Probably the most useful and readable account is in Matter, *Bismarck et son temps,* vol. III, a book based on wide and careful investigation, impartial in tone, an interesting narrative. The writings of Marcks and Lenz, cited above, should be used. Bismarck's *Reflections and Reminiscences,* vol. II, chaps. XXIV-XXXIII, concern the period 1871-1888. The *Memoirs of Prince Chlodwig of Hohenlohe-Schillingsfuerst,* 2 vols. (1906), are of importance. Hohenlohe was head of the Bavarian ministry 1866-1870, German ambassador to Paris 1874-1885, and Chancellor of the Empire 1894-1900. The *Memoirs* throw light upon the relations between the South German States and the North German Confederation, upon the conflict with the Roman Catholic Church, and upon French politics from 1874 to 1885. Of slight importance for the period after 1890.

On the Kulturkampf: Hahn, *Geschichte des Kulturkampfes;* on Social Democracy: E. Milhaud, *La Démocratie socialiste allemande* (1903); Kirkup, *History of Socialism* (1906), chaps. V, VII, IX (contains Erfurt programme in full, pp. 223-229); Werner Sombart, *Socialism* (1898); A. Schaeffle, *The Quintessence of Socialism;* W. H. Dawson, *Bismarck and State Socialism* (1891); on protection: W. H. Dawson, *Protection in Germany, A History of German Fiscal Policy During the Nineteenth Century* (1904), the best book in English on the subject, coming down to the tariff of 1902; on state insurance: F. W. Lewis, *State Insurance,* chap. IV (Boston, 1909); also, J. G. Brooks, *Compulsory Insurance in Germany;* Ludwig Lass, *German Workmen's Insurance;* on government: B. E. Howard, *The German Empire* (1906), an exhaustive account of the structure of the imperial government, not a description of the manner in which it works, a juridical rather than an historical study; Lowell, *Governments and Parties,* chaps. V, VI, VII, an account of both structure and operation of imperial and state governments; Combes de Lestrade, *Les monarchies de l'empire allemand, organisation constitutionelle et administrative* (1904); probably the best, most complete account of German governments, imperial and state; describes the powers and functions of sovereigns,

chambers, ministers, communes, financial and judicial systems, etc.; Charles Borgeaud, *The Adoption and Amendment of Constitutions in Europe and America,* translated by C. D. Hazen (1895), pp. 47-78. Kloeppel, P., *Dreissig Jahre deutscher Verfassungsgeschichte, 1867-1897;* vol. I (1900) covers period to 1877; Laband, P., *Das Staatsrecht des deutschen Reiches,* 4 vols. (4th edit., 1901), a very important work on German public law. Has been translated into French. The most informing book on present day Germany is W. H. Dawson's *The Evolution of Modern Germany* (1908), a book that aims to trace the economic and social transformation of Germany, her industrial and colonial expansion, the growth of socialism, etc. See, also, E. D. Howard, *The Recent Industrial Progress of Germany* (1907); "Veritas," *The German Empire of To-day* (1902); Eltzbacher, O. (or J. Ellis Barker), *Modern Germany, Her Political and Economic Problems* (1905).

CHAPTER XV

The Third Republic

There is no satisfactory history of the Third Republic in English. Lowell, *Governments and Parties,* chap. II, has a clear outline of party history down to 1896. Coubertin, *Evolution of the Third Republic,* is not always clear, presupposes some knowledge of the subject, contains chapters on education, the army, literature, socialism; is poorly translated. F. Lawton, *The Third French Republic* (1909), covers in a superficial way the years 1871-1906, and has entertaining chapters on literature, science, art, education, the parliamentary system. W. G. Berry, *France since Waterloo* (1909), devotes pages 249-368 to the years 1871-1908. A work of great importance, detailed, authoritative, and brilliantly written is Hanotaux, *Contemporary France,* 4 vols. (1903-1909), covering the years 1871-1882, a full narrative, abounding in vivid and instructive accounts of men and events. Zevort, E., *Histoire de la Troisième République,* 4 vols. (1896-1901), covers the years 1870-1894, a useful narrative, full of detail, fair, careful, pleasantly written. Labusquière, *La Troisième République, 1871-1900,* is vol. XII of Jaurès, *Histoire Socialiste.* F. T. Marzials, *Life of Léon Gambetta* in the Statesmen Series (London, 1890), is a brief account. Charles de Mazade, *Monsieur Thiers, Cinquante années d'histoire contemporaine* (1884), is an interesting book. More important is the life of *Jules Ferry* by Alfred Rambaud (Paris, 1903), a biography of a forceful and far-sighted statesman, a founder of the Republic, written by a trained historian. See, also, Henry Leyret, *Waldeck-Rousseau et la Troisième République, 1869-1899.*

On protection: see, H. O. Meredith, *Protection in France;* on labor and social movements: G. Weill, *Histoire du mouvement social en France, 1852-1902* (1905), pp. 133-472, with bibliography; on diplomatic history: Hippeau, *Histoire diplomatique de la Troisième République* (1888); A. Tardieu, *France and the Alliances* (1908); Billot, M. A., *La France et l'Italie, Histoire des années troubles* (1905); the author was French ambassador in Rome, and treats of the period between 1881 and 1899—useful for French history, also for Italian; on colonial expansion: Levasseur, *La France et ses colonies,* 3 vols. (1889); L. Vignon, *L'expansion de la France* (1891), and by the same author, *Les colonies françaises, leur commerce, leur situation économique, leur utilité pour la métropole, leur avenir* (1886), containing a description of the different French colonies; Dubois et Terrier, *Les colonies françaises: un siècle d'expansion coloniale, 1800-1900* (1902); on the Dreyfus case;

Reinach, J., *L'affaire Dreyfus,* 5 vols. 1901-1902; also by Dreyfus himself, *Five Years of My Life* (1901); Steevens, *The Tragedy of Dreyfus* (1899).

On state and church: Arthur Galton, *Church and State in France, 1300-1907,* pp. 201-268. Of the first importance is Debidour, A., *L'Église Catholique et L'État sous la Troisième République, 1870-1906,* 2 vols. (Paris, 1906-1909). Vol. I covers the period 1870-1889; vol. II, 1889-1906; the fullest account concerning the separation of Church and State to be found is in vol. II, pp. 231-498; excellent bibliographies; many important documents, including the law of April 13, 1908, modifying certain articles of the law of December 9, 1905. See, also, Briand, A., *La Séparation des Églises et de l'État. Rapport fait au nom de la Commission de la Chambre des Députés, suivies des pièces annexes* (1905). On the government of France, the best description in English is Lowell's *Governments and Parties,* chaps. I and II. This is far superior to Bodley, J. S. C., *France,* 2 vols. (1898), a pretentious book which, with much information, is dominated by the melancholy thesis that parliamentary government is unsuccessful in France, because it is not the same as parliamentary government in England. The book contains many other preconceptions, more entertaining than important. Lebon and Pelet, *France as It Is* (1888), is a useful book. George, W. L., *France in the Twentieth Century* (1909), contains chapters on the political institutions, relations of church and state, socialism, trades-unionism, colonies, education, etc., of France of the present day. A penetrating analysis of the French mind and character and description of French conditions is W. C. Brownell's *French Traits, an Essay in Comparative Criticism* (1889). Useful collections of the constitutions of France are: Duguit et Monnier, *Les constitutions et les principales lois politiques de la France depuis 1789* (2nd edit., 1908); Hélie, F. A., *Les constitutions de la France* (1880). Professor F. M. Anderson has rendered an important service to students by translating many of the important documents in the history of nineteenth century France in his *Constitutions and Documents* (2nd edit., revised and enlarged, 1909). Pellisson, *Les orateurs politiques de la France de 1830 à nos jours,* pp. 381-434; contains extracts illustrating the history of the Third Republic from 1871 to 1889.

CHAPTER XVI

The Kingdom of Italy

The literature on this period of Italian history is not extensive. Stillman's history may be used; pages 358 to 393 cover the years 1871 to 1886. Lowell's account of party history down to 1896 is clear and his description of the political institutions adequate, *Governments and Parties,* vol. I, chaps. III and IV. Stillman's *Francesco Crispi* (1899) and Justin McCarthy's *Pope Leo XIII* (1896) are useful biographies. A. Billot, *La France et l'Italie, 1881-1899,* 2 vols. (1905), a book by a former French ambassador to Italy. For present conditions in Italy: see, King and Okey, *Italy To-day* (2nd edit., 1909); W. R. Thayer, *Italica* (1908), containing an essay on "Thirty Years of Italian Progress," and one on "Italy in 1907"; Ed Driault, *Les problèmes politiques et sociaux à la fin du XIXe siècle* (1900), chap. II, La question romaine: le pape, le roi, le peuple.

The *Encyclopedia Americana* contains more than thirty articles, mostly by Italian specialists, on various Italian institutions and conditions.

CHAPTER XVII

Austria-Hungary Since 1849

On Austria and Hungary, there is very little that is important in English. Leger, L., *History of Austro-Hungary* (1889), chaps. XXXIII-XXXVIII, is probably the most satisfactory treatment. Whitman, S., *Austria* (Story of the Nations Series), gives a brief account of the period from 1815 to 1898, pp. 308-381. *Cambridge Modern History,* vol. XI, chap. XV, contains an account of the reaction and reorganization in Austria, Prussia, and the German Confederation, by Professor Friedjung, of the University of Vienna. Consult, also, *Ibid.* chap. XVI. Seignobos has useful chapters. Vámbéry, A., *The Story of Hungary* (The Story of the Nations Series, 1886), pp. 400-440. Florence Arnold Forster, *Francis Deák, A Memoir,* first published anonymously (1880), is important for the period 1840 to 1876. Sir Horace Rumbold's *Francis Joseph and His Times* (1909) is an interesting and vivid account of this reign. The author was long British ambassador at Vienna. His book is useful, though frequently superficial and biased. Rumbold has, however, made much use of the solid works of Friedjung.

The most important work on Austria after 1848 is H. Friedjung, *Oesterreich von 1848 bis 1860,* of which vol. I, *Die Jahre der Revolution und der Reform, 1848-1851,* has appeared (3rd edit., Stuttgart, 1908). L. Eisenmann, *Le Compromis Austro-Hongrois,* is very valuable: on the period of reaction, 1849-1859, see pp. 149-203; on the various attempts at constitution-making, the struggle over the unitary and federal principles, see *Ibid.,* pp. 207-399. See, also, *Deák. A Memoir,* passim; A. de Bertha, *La Hongrie moderne, de 1849 à 1901* (Paris, 1901), a book by a native of Hungary, laudatory of men and things Hungarian, yet well-informed and useful. Chap. I describes Hungary under Austrian absolutism, 1849-1859; chap. II, Hungary under the provisional schemes, 1859-1865. H. Friedjung, *Der Kampf um die Vorherrschaft in Deutschland,* is invaluable for the period 1859-1866. On the making of the Ausgleich, 1865-1867: see, Eisenmann, *Le Compromis Austro-Hongrois,* pp. 403-657; Forster, *Deák, A Memoir,* pp. 113-322; Bertha, *La Hongrie moderne,* chap. III, pp. 83-160; see, also, Bertha, *La constitution hongroise* (Paris, 1898), a good outline and description containing chapters on the laws of 1848, on the attempts at centralization, on dualism, on Croatia, the nationalities, development from 1867-1897; see, also, M. G. Horn, *Le compromis de 1868 entre la Hongrie et la Croatie* (Paris, 1907). Bertha also has a book on *François Joseph I et son règne, 1848-1888* (Paris, 1888). See, also, Beust, *Aus drei Viertel-Jahrhunderten,* vols. I and II (Stuttgart, 1887). On the working of the Ausgleich; Eisenmann, *Le Compromis Austro-Hongrois,* pp. 659-680; on history of Hungary, 1867-1901: Bertha, *La Hongrie moderne,* pp. 161-358. A clear and instructive account of party history in Austria-Hungary from 1867 to 1896, and a description of the political institutions of each country, and of the Dual Monarchy, is given by Lowell in *Governments and Parties,* vol. II, chaps. VIII-X. The fullest account of Bohemia in the nineteenth century is to be found in E. Denis, *La Bohême depuis la Montagne-Blanche,* 2 vols. (Paris, 1903); vol. II, pp. 381-670, covers the period from 1850 to 1901.

For descriptions of contemporary Austria and Hungary: Geoffrey Drage, *Austria-Hungary* (1909); Scotus-Viator (R. W. Seton-Watson), *The Future of the Hungarian Nation* (1908), and (by the same author) *Racial Problems in Hungary* (1908); A. R. Colquhoun, *The Whirlpool of Europe* (1907). A careful, scientific study of the races and nationalities in the dual monarchy is Auerbach, *Les races et les nationalités en*

Autriche-Hongrie (1898). The leading authority on Austrian public law is Ulbrich, J., *Oesterreiches Staatsrecht* (3rd edit., Tübingen, 1904). See, also, for general conditions: André Chéradame, *L'Europe et la question d'Autriche au seuil du XX^e siècle* (Paris, 1901, 452 pp.); Driault, *Le monde actuel* (1909), chap. III.

CHAPTER XVIII

England to the Reform Bill of 1832

The best bibliographies on English history during the nineteenth century are in vols. XI and XII of Hunt and Poole's *Political History of England.* These are arranged under topics and are not mere lists of titles but are critical and descriptive, and constitute a very valuable guide. There are lists, without criticism, in connection with the various chapters of the *Cambridge Modern History.* Traill, *Social England,* vol. VI, contains useful bibliographies on many subjects not included in the preceding lists, such as literature, arts, sciences, industries, social life, etc. One can find source material in a form available for class use in Cheyney, *Readings in English History Drawn from the Original Sources* (1908), pp. 663-767; Adams and Stephens, *Select Documents of English Constitutional History* (1901), pp. 507-555; Robinson and Beard, *Readings in Modern European History* (1909), vol. II, pp. 239-337; Kendall, *Source-Book of English History* (1900), pp. 381-465; Lee, *Source-Book of English History* (1900), pp. 497-585. The fullest and most informing general history of this period is Walpole, *History of England Since 1815* (1890), reaching to 1856, a work of solid scholarship and abundantly supplied with references to authorities; indispensable. Molesworth, *History of England,* 3 vols., is particularly full on the reform movements; account of the reform of 1832 exceptionally good. Brodrick and Fotheringham, vol. XI, in Hunt and Poole, *The Political History of England,* covering years 1801-1837, a book marked by good judgment and accuracy, but overloaded with detail, a clear, substantial, and dry résumé. See, also, Bright, *History of England,* vol. III; Traill, *Social England,* vol. VI, illustrated edit., more an encyclopedia of history than a history itself, with articles by specialists on many different departments of the national life, religion, laws, learning, arts, industry, commerce, manners. The political sections are the least satisfactory. The illustrations are numerous and admirable. Oman, *England in the Nineteenth Century* (1899), a sketch of no great importance, readable but not always impartial. On Catholic Emancipation: see, Bryce, *Two Centuries of Irish History,* pp. 272-314; W. E. H. Lecky, *Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland,* 2 vols. (new edit., 1903). Vol. II is a life of O'Connell; Shaw-Lefevre, G. J., *Peel and O'Connell. A Review of the Irish Policy of Parliament from the Union to the Death of Sir Robert Peel* (1887), pp. 1-13; Parker, C. S., *Sir Robert Peel,* 3 vols. (1899); vol. I, chaps. IX-XII; vol. II, chaps. III-V. On the movement for parliamentary reform: see, Molesworth, *History of England,* vol. I; McCarthy, *Epoch of Reform,* a convenient and clear, brief account; Rose, J. H., *The Rise and Growth of Democracy in Great Britain* (1898), chaps. I and II. An indispensable work for the understanding of the political system of England before the Reform Bill is Porritt, E. and A. G., *The Unreformed House of Commons,* 2 vols. (1903), a clear, full, authoritative description of the representative system in England, not at all a description of the Reform itself. On the Reform: consult, also, Walpole, *Life of Lord John Russell,* and Stuart Reid, *Life and Letters of Lord*

Durham, 2 vols. (1906). Books important for understanding the movement of ideas are KENT, C. B. R., *The English Radicals* (1899); SIR LESLIE STEPHEN, *The English Utilitarians* (1900), both valuable for the history of the radical party; DICEY, A. V., *Lectures on the Relation Between Law and Public Opinion in England During the Nineteenth Century* (1905), a masterly exposition, commentary, and criticism; indispensable for the history of the whole century; contains an admirable statement of the influence of Bentham upon the legislation; valuable footnotes. On the foreign policy of Canning, the recent *Life of Canning* by H. W. V. TEMPERLEY (1905) is useful. Though written from the point of view of an advocate and defender, chaps. VIII-XII contain some new material on England and the Holy Alliance, the Congresses, America, and Greece. STAPLETON's older *Political Life of George Canning,* 3 vols. (1831), is very valuable for foreign relations. W. CUNNINGHAM, *The Growth of English Industry and Commerce in Modern Times,* 3 vols., is best on the period before the nineteenth century. Vol. III, covering period from 1776-1850, does little more than touch on general aspects. Important matters are treated very slightly—as, for instance, the work of Huskisson.

CHAPTER XIX

ENGLAND BETWEEN TWO REFORMS

On this period, WALPOLE, *History of England Since 1815,* remains the most important account. Vols. III, IV, V, and VI cover the period from 1832-1856; and the same author brings his narrative down to 1880 in his *History of Twenty-five Years,* 4 vols. (1904-1908), of which vols. I and II concern the period treated in this chapter. MOLESWORTH's *History of England* and TRAILL's *Social England,* vol. VI, continue useful. The volume by LOW and SANDERS in the *Political History of England* covers the whole reign of Victoria (1837-1901), and is the best single volume on the subject. It is a clear, solid, and substantial history of political warfare and parliamentary proceedings, but is colorless and overloaded with details. Its critical bibliography is a very useful feature of the book. JUSTIN MCCARTHY, *History of Our Own Times,* covers the Queen's reign in 5 vols., is written by a journalist and active politician, is very readable, interesting for its portraits of important persons and its description of events, but is diffuse and sometimes trivial. MCCARTHY, J., *Short History of Our Own Times* (1908), 1 vol., treats the entire reign. HERBERT PAUL, *A History of Modern England,* 5 vols. (1904-1906), covers the years from 1846 to 1895, is a direct and vivid narrative, limited largely to parliamentary proceedings, with, however, chapters on literature and theology and ecclesiastical disputes; no treatment of social and economic problems and changes; written with dash and emphasis, always confident, frequently partisan; standpoint that of a Gladstonian Liberal.

The biographical literature on this period is very extensive. The best life of Queen Victoria is by SIDNEY LEE (1903); contains an excellent bibliography. Of very great value are *The Letters of Queen Victoria,* edited by BENSON and FISHER, in 3 vols. (1907). There are two editions of this work, one costing three pounds, the other costing six shillings, the latter not sold, at present, in the United States. This is a selection from the Queen's correspondence between the years 1837 and 1861, very important as proving the Queen's ability and worth, her seriousness and intelligence as a ruler; also, as throwing much light on the characters and conduct of important statesmen, Melbourne, Peel, Palmerston, Russell, and others. A work of great historical significance.

Brief biographies of the leading statesmen of the realm are contained in the series called *The Prime Ministers of Queen Victoria,* edited by STUART J. REID, a volume devoted to each. MORLEY'S *Life of W. E. Gladstone,* 3 vols. (1903), and *Life of Richard Cobden* (1881); DALLING'S and ASHLEY'S *Life of Palmerston* (1879); ROBERTSON'S *Life of John Bright* (1889); WALPOLE'S *Life of Lord John Russell,* 2 vols. (1879); S. J. REID'S *Lord John Russell* (1895); ROSEBERY'S *Sir Robert Peel* (1899); SIR T. MARTIN'S *Life of the Prince Consort,* 5 vols. (1874-1880); HODDER'S *Life of the Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury,* 3 vols. (1886); FRANK PODMORE'S *Life of Robert Owen,* 2 vols. (1906); and GRAHAM WALLAS'S *Life of Francis Place* (1891), are among the most useful biographies on the period.

On Chartism: see, R. G. GAMMAGE, *History of Chartism* (1894); CARLYLE, T., *Chartism;* ROSE, *The Rise of Democracy,* chaps. VI, VII, and VIII; THOMAS COOPER'S *Life,* Written by Himself (1872). On Free Trade movement: ARMITAGE-SMITH, *The Free Trade Movement* (1898); MORLEY, *Life of Cobden;* DISRAELI, *Life of Sir George Bentinck;* PARKER, C. S., *Sir Robert Peel,* 3 vols. (1899), vol. III, an important collection of Peel's correspondence; also, *Memoirs of Sir Robert Peel,* 2 vols. (1856-1857). See, also, J. S. NICHOLSON, *History of the English Corn Laws* (1904). On factory legislation: B. L. HUTCHINS and L. HARRISON, *History of Factory Legislation* (1903). On the American Civil War: see, WALPOLE, *History of Twenty-five Years,* vol. II, chap. VIII. On constitutional questions: see, SIR THOMAS ERSKINE MAY, *Constitutional History of England;* TASWELL-LANGMEAD, *English Constitutional History.*

CHAPTER XX

ENGLAND UNDER GLADSTONE AND DISRAELI

For this period, the general histories are: WALPOLE, *History of Twenty-five Years,* vols. II, III, and IV (coming down to 1880); PAUL, *History of Modern England,* vols. III and IV; BRIGHT, *History of England,* vol. IV, pp. 450-577; vol. V, pp. 1-87; MCCARTHY, *History of Our Own Times,* vols. II and III; LOW and SANDERS, pp. 223-376; TRAILL'S *Social England.* MORLEY'S *Life of Gladstone* is indispensable, written by a close personal friend, an experienced politician, and a master of historical prose. FITZMAURICE, *Life of Earl Granville,* 2 vols. (1905), vol. II; and WINSTON CHURCHILL, *Lord Randolph Churchill,* 2 vols. (1906), are important for the period. There is unfortunately no satisfactory life of Lord Beaconsfield. FROUDE'S biography in the Queen's Prime Ministers series, is brief, superficial, and is very poor on the administration 1874-1880. BRYCE has an essay on Lord Beaconsfield in his *Studies in Contemporary Biography* (1903), and SIR SPENCER WALPOLE one in his *Studies in Biography* (1907). T. S. KEBBEL, *Selected Speeches of the Earl of Beaconsfield,* 2 vols. (1882), is useful. On Ireland: see, JOHNSTON and SPENCER, *Ireland's Story;* BRYCE, J., editor, *Two Centuries of Irish History* (1888); J. MCCARTHY, *Ireland and Her Story;* WILLIAM O'CONNOR MORRIS, *Ireland, 1798-1898* (1898); W. P. O'BRIEN, *The Great Famine* (1896); R. B. O'BRIEN, *Parliamentary History of the Irish Land Question* (1880), *Fifty Years of Concessions to Ireland,* 2 vols. (1883-1885), *Irish Wrongs and English Remedies* (1887). G. SHAW-LEFEVRE, *English and Irish Land Questions* (1881), contains a study of the Bright Clauses of the Land Act of 1870, pp. 115-165. A. G. RICHEY, *The Irish Land Laws* (1880), discusses at length the Land Act of 1870.

CHAPTER XXI

England Since 1886

The most satisfactory account of recent English history is J. F. Bright, *History of England,* vol. V, 1880-1901, a book of solid merits; clearness of arrangement, directness of narrative, and remarkable freedom from partisanship. For the period of this chapter; see, also, Low and Sanders, pp. 366-489; Paul, *Modern England,* vol. V; McCarthy, *Our Own Times,* vol. III, chaps. X-XXV. Of the first importance for the Home Rule bills is Morley, *Life of Gladstone,* vol. III, a book that by reason of Morley's intimacy with Gladstone at this time has practically the value of a source; see, also, Churchill's *Lord Randolph Churchill,* vol. II, and Fitzmaurice's *Life of Earl Granville,* vol. II, chaps. XIII-XIV, authoritative biographies, based on letters and documents. Churchill's great influence on the Conservative party is clearly shown by the former. Consult, also, R. B. O'Brien, *Life of Charles Stewart Parnell,* 3 vols. (1898). Interesting personal descriptions and appreciations of Gladstone are James Bryce, *William Ewart Gladstone,* in his *Studies in Contemporary Biography* (also published separately as a booklet), and Sir E. W. Hamilton, *Mr. Gladstone, a Monograph* (1898). Lord Rosebery, *Lord Randolph Churchill* (1896), is also suggestive. Traill, *Life of the Marquis of Salisbury,* contains practically nothing after 1886. H. Whates, *The Third Salisbury Administration* (1895-1900), is a useful book, containing maps and diplomatic papers bearing on the South African war.

On Ireland, a very important monograph is L. Paul Dubois, *Contemporary Ireland* (1908). This is an English translation of *L'Irlande contemporaine* (Paris, 1907). Paul Dubois was the son-in-law of Taine. His book is largely historical and is useful for the whole nineteenth century. It contains a full discussion of the land question, and educational, economic, and religious problems.

On the revived interest in the question of Protection and Free Trade: see, G. Armitage-Smith, *The Free Trade Movement and Its Results* (1898); W. Smart, *The Return of Protection* (1903); W. J. Ashley, *The Tariff Problem* (1903); W. Cunningham, *The Rise and Decline of the Free Trade Movement* (2nd ed., 1905). These represent various points of view. While the theoretical economists like Marshall at Cambridge, and Edgeworth at Oxford, adhere to the belief in free trade, the economic historians, Cunningham and Ashley, have adopted the Chamberlain programme on the ground that the rise of industrial rivals and the decline of her own resources have created a critical situation for England, and that one way of recovering or maintaining her leadership is a closer union of the empire, which, it is held, a system of protection would facilitate. An interesting general view by an outside observer is to be found in Carl Johannes Fuchs, *The Trade Policy of Great Britain and Her Colonies Since 1860,* a German book translated by C. H. M. Archibald (1905). On education: see, Sir Henry Craik, *The State in its Relation to Education* (2nd edit., 1896); Graham Balfour, *The Educational Systems of Great Britain and Ireland* (2nd edit., 1903), a comprehensive account of general education in the United Kingdom during the nineteenth century, based on departmental reports and the blue books of the numerous commissions which have investigated the subject; full of precise information. A very useful comparison of the systems of England, the United States, France, and Germany, is to be found in R. E. Hughes, *The Making of Citizens: A Study in Comparative Education* (1902). On government: see, A. L. Lowell, *The Government of England,* 2 vols. (1908), by far the most

authoritative, comprehensive, and illuminating treatise on the subject; a study, moreover, broadly conceived; indispensable not only for its profound and clear analysis and description of British government, imperial, national, and local, but for the light it throws upon party machinery and present party programmes or tendencies. Other useful books on English government are the various volumes of the English Citizen Series, edited by HENRY CRAIK; also, A. V. DICEY, *The Law of the Constitution of the United Kingdom* (1885); SIDNEY LOW, *The Governance of England* (1904). An excellent brief description is T. F. MORAN, *The Theory and Practice of the English Government* (1903). BAGEHOT, *English Constitution*, and BOUTMY, *The English Constitution*, are also useful. Of the first importance is ANSON, *Law and Custom of the Constitution*, 2 vols. (1892). See, also, ALPHEUS TODD, *Parliamentary Government in England*, 2 vols. (2nd edit., 1887-1889). A useful abridgment and revision of this work was made by Sir Spencer Walpole and published in 1892. SIR COURTNEY ILBERT, *Legislative Methods and Forms* (Oxford, 1901), is an authority. The fullest historical account of parliamentary procedure is REDLICH, J., *The Procedure of the House of Commons, a Study of its History and Present Form*, 3 vols. (1908).

CHAPTER XXII

THE BRITISH EMPIRE IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

On the general subject of European colonial expansion, the most extensive work is ALFRED ZIMMERMANN'S *Die europäischen Kolonien* (1895-1903). Five volumes have appeared. The first volume treats of the colonial policy of Spain and Portugal to the present, the second that of Great Britain to the American Revolution, the third that of Great Britain since the American Revolution, the fourth that of France to the present, the fifth that of the Netherlands. The volumes are well supplied with bibliographies and maps. CHARLES DE LANNOY and HERMANN VAN DER LINDEN have undertaken a work called *Histoire de l'expansion coloniale des peuples européens*, intended to show how each nation has acquired its colonies, how it has developed them, what the characteristics of each are. One volume was published in 1907 (Brussels), with bibliography and maps. It gives an account of Portuguese and Spanish colonies to the beginning of the nineteenth century. A useful book is PAUL LEROY-BEAULIEU'S *La colonisation chez les peuples modernes*, 2 vols. (6th edit., 1908).

On English colonial expansion in general: ZIMMERMANN, cited above; H. E. EGERTON, *A Short History of British Colonial Policy* (1897); covers the period from Cabot, 1497, down, treating British colonization as a continuous movement; the latter part concerns the nineteenth century; a careful, thoughtful book. By the same author, *The Origin and Growth of the English Colonies and of their System of Government* (Oxford, 1904), being an introduction to LUCAS'S *Historical Geography of the British Colonies*. Contains very interesting chapters on the labor problem in new colonies, on the introduction of responsible government, on the problem of the future relations between the colonies and the mother country; also, a chronological outline of the various acquisitions made by Great Britain during the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries. SIR CHARLES DILKE, *Problems of Greater Britain* (1890), has had a great influence in educating English opinion to the importance of the Empire and is full of information; by the same author, *The British Empire* (1899), a sort of birds-eye view. C. P.

Lucas's *Historical Geography of the British Empire,* 6 vols., new edit., 1906 ——, in course of publication, is of the first importance, comprehensive, accurate, containing much historical matter. W. H. Woodward's *Short History of the Expansion of the British Empire, 1500-1870* (Cambridge, 1899), is a useful epitome. E. J. Payne, *Colonies and Colonial Federations* (1904), studies the Empire from geographical, historical, economic, and political points of view. See, also, Greswell, W. P., *The Growth and Administration of British Colonies, 1837-1897* (1898). J. R. Seeley, *Expansion of England,* is useful for an understanding of the general subject. *The British Empire Series,* 5 vols. (1899-1902), contains a large amount of information, historical, political, economic, conditions for colonization, outlook for the future, etc.; vol. I concerns India; vol. II, British Africa; vol. III, British America; vol. IV, Australia. Bryce's *Studies in History and Jurisprudence* contain very important studies on The Roman Empire and the British Empire in India, on Two South African Constitutions, and on the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia. Consult, also, on the Empire: Lowell, *The Government of England,* vol. II, chaps. LIV-LVIII; *Cambridge Modern History,* vol. XI, chaps. XXVI and XXVII, with bibliographies; also, for colonial development from 1815-1852, mainly in South Africa and Australia: Walpole's *History of England Since 1815,* vol. VI, pp. 325-379; also A. T. Story, *The British Empire* (Story of the Nations Series). Alpheus Todd, *Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies* (2nd edit., 1894), is an authoritative treatment of the operation of responsible government in the colonies.

On India: see, *Cambridge Modern History,* vol. XI, chap. XXVI (from 1815 to 1869); R. W. Fraser, *British Rule in India* (Story of the Nations Series); Boulger, *India in the Nineteenth Century* (1901); Digby, *Prosperous British India* (1901), a severe arraignment of British government in India; M. Innes, *The Sepoy Revolt* (1897); Sir John Kaye, *The Sepoy War,* 3 vols. (1864-1876), completed by G. B. Malleson (1878-1880); G. W. Forrest, *A History of the Indian Mutiny, Reviewed and Illustrated from Original Documents,* 2 vols. (1904); G. B. Malleson, *The Indian Mutiny of 1857* (1891); Lilly, *India and Its Problems.* A. L. Lowell has a valuable chapter on the Civil Service of India in his *Colonial Civil Service* (1900). Sir Courtney Ilbert, *The Government of India* (1898), is pronounced by Lowell to be "by far the best work on the public law of India."

On Canada: Bibliography may be found in the *A. L. A. Annotated Guide to the Literature of American History,* edited by J. N. Larned (1902); bibliographies also in *Cambridge Modern History,* vol. XI, and in Low and Sanders, *History of England, 1837-1901.* Good brief histories are: Sir John Bourinot, *Canada Under British Rule, 1760-1900*; C. G. D. Roberts, *History of Canada* (1904). Kingsford's elaborate history in ten volumes only reaches 1841. On Lord Durham's mission: see, F. Bradshaw, *Self-Government in Canada and How it was Achieved, the Story of Lord Durham's Report* (London, 1903); eight chapters are devoted to a careful account of the history of Canada to the outbreak of the Rebellion, and show the growth of the demand for responsible government; see, also, S. J. Reid, *Life and Letters of Lord Durham,* 2 vols. (1906), a very laudatory book but full of information concerning Lord Durham's work in Canada. Lord Durham's *Report* was republished in London in 1901. Perhaps the best manual dealing with the constitutional history of Canada is Sir John Bourinot's *A Manual of the Constitutional History of Canada* (1901). *Canadian Constitutional Development,* by H. E. Egerton and W. L. Grant (1907), contains speeches and despatches pertinent to the subject, with introduction and notes; see, also, William Houston,

Documents Illustrative of the Canadian Constitution (1891). *Canada and the Empire,* by E. Montague and B. Herbert (1904), is written from an imperialist standpoint. Holland, B., *Imperium et Libertas. A Study in History and Politics* (1901); pp. 95-190 treat Canadian history from 1763 to 1867.

On Australasia: see, the excellent *History of the Australasian Colonies* by E. Jenks (1895), which comes down to 1893; also, G. Tregarthen, *Australian Commonwealth* (Story of the Nations Series); comes down to 1891; also an admirable volume by J. D. Rogers in Lucas's *Historical Geography of the British Colonies,* vol. VI (1907). The most valuable work for the recent constitutional development is *The Annotated Constitution of the Australian Commonwealth* by Sir J. Quick, and R. R. Garran (Sydney, 1901). This contains a full history of the movement toward federation and of each clause of the constitution. W. H. Moore, *The Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia* (1902), is an important commentary. Bryce has a useful account of the making and character of the constitution in his *Studies in History and Jurisprudence.* On social and economic conditions and measures and experiments: see, Reeves, *The Long White Cloud* (1899), and *State Experiments in Australia and New Zealand,* 2 vols. (1902); H. D. Lloyd, *Newest England* (New Zealand and Australia) (1900); V. Clark, *The Labor Movement in Australia.* The most recent book is by B. R. Wise, entitled *The Commonwealth of Australia* (Boston, 1909), a description of the country, of political institutions, of industrial legislation, etc. On New Zealand: see, also, Sir Arthur P. Douglas, *The Dominion of New Zealand* (1909).

For South Africa: see, G. M. Theal, *South Africa* (Story of the Nations Series, 1894); pp. 138-387 cover the years 1815-1890; Frank R. Cana, *South Africa from the Great Trek to the Union* (1909). An excellent account of the history of Europeans in South Africa down to 1895 is contained in Bryce's *Impressions of South Africa* (1897), pp. 99-182. A clear account of the causes and early course of the Boer war is given in Bright's *History of England,* vol. V, pp. 234-266. Many of the important state papers, mostly English, bearing on this war, are in Larned, *History for Ready Reference,* vol. VI, pp. 456-517. For the Boer side of the case: see, the *Memoirs* of Paul Kruger. Sir A. Conan Doyle, *The Great Boer War* (1902), is a useful narrative, from the British standpoint. The Times *History of the War in South Africa,* edited by L. C. Amery, vols. I-IV (1900-1906), is very detailed. On the literature of the South African War: see, *American Historical Review,* vol. XII, pp. 299-321. On the recent federation movement: see, R. H. Brand, *The Union of South Africa* (1909), which contains the South Africa Act of 20th September, 1909, an account of its elaboration and adoption and a study of its provisions.

On the reaction of imperialism upon the mother country: see, Richard Jebb, *Studies in Colonial Nationalism* (1905); contains chapters on Canada, From Colonies to Commonwealth (Australia), New Zealand, South African War, the Colonial Conference of 1902, Nationalism in Tariffs, and Imperial Partnership. See, also, J. W. Root, *Colonial Tariffs* (Liverpool, 1906); Carl Johannes Fuchs, *The Trade Policy of Great Britain and her Colonies Since 1860* (1905). See, also, Bernard Holland, *Imperium et Libertas* (1901), pp. 265-319. An important work concerning the colonies, recently published, is *The Legislation of the Empire: Being a Survey of the Legislative Enactments of the British Dominions from 1898 to 1909.* Edited by C. E. A. Bedwell, with a preface by Lord Rosebery, 4 vols. (1909). Contains about 25,000 acts and ordinances.

CHAPTER XXIII

Africa

For explorations in Africa: see, *David Livingstone,* by Thomas Hughes (1889); (by Livingstone himself), *Missionary Travels and Researches in South Africa* (1857), and *Last Journals in Central Africa,* from 1865 to death, edited by Waller (1875); H. M. Stanley, *How I Found Livingstone; Travels, Adventures, and Discoveries in Central Africa* (1872); *Through the Dark Continent or the Sources of the Nile,* 2 vols. (1878); *The Congo and the Founding of Its Free State,* 2 vols. (1885); *In Darkest Africa,* 2 vols. (1890); *The Autobiography of Henry M. Stanley,* edited by his wife, Dorothy Stanley (1909), chaps. XIII, XV-XVIII; V. L. Cameron, *Across Africa* (1876); Carl Peters, *New Light on Dark Africa* (1891). A very useful collection of contemporary accounts is, *Africa and Its Exploration, as Told by Its Explorers,* 2 vols. (London, Sampson Low, Marston & Co., no date). See, also, Robert Brown, *Story of Africa,* 4 vols. (1894-1895).

On the partition of Africa, the most important book is J. Scott Keltie, *The Partition of Africa* (1895); see, also, Émile Banning, *Le partage politique de l'Afrique d'après les transactions internationales les plus récentes, 1885-1888* (1888); A. S. White, *The Development of Africa. A Study in Applied Geography* (2nd edit., 1892); for a short account, Rose, J. H., *The Development of European Nations,* vol. II, chap. VII. Sir Harry Johnston, *History of the Colonization of Africa by Alien Races* (1899), is a very useful manual, compressing a large amount of information into a small compass; written by a man who is an authority on African affairs, having traveled extensively in that continent, and having been consul and administrator there; describes the efforts of the Portuguese, Dutch, English, and the other nations; has brief chapters on the history of the slave trade, of exploration, of missions, etc.

On England in Egypt: Rose, *Development of European Nations,* vol. II, chaps. IV-VI; Cromer, *Modern Egypt,* 2 vols. (1908), practically a history of Egypt from 1876 to 1908, of the Dual Control which was succeeded by the Single Control of England, by the man who was the British representative in Egypt for twenty-seven years. An invaluable book, marked by a wealth of precise information, by positiveness, by judicial temper, and by an extraordinary detachment of view. Is, to a considerable degree, an historical source as well as a history. For an important review of this book by Mr. Bryce, see, *American Historical Review,* vol. XIV, pp. 357-362. On the British intervention and the Gordon chapter one should consult in addition to Cromer: Morley's *Gladstone,* vol. III, and Fitzmaurice's *Granville,* vol. II. Other important books on Egypt are: Sir Alfred Milner's *England in Egypt* (11th edit., 1904); Sir A. Colvin's *The Making of Modern Egypt* (2nd edit., 1906); A. Métin's *La Transformation de l'Égypte* (1903); J. C. Roux, *L'Isthme et le Canal de Suez,* 2 vols. (1901). Popular accounts are E. Dicey, *Story of the Khedivate* (1902), and *The Egypt of the Future* (1906). The Story of Kitchener's campaign is graphically told by G. W. Steevens, *With Kitchener to Khartum* (1898). On the Congo Free State, there is a short account in Rose, *Development of European Nations,* vol. II, chap. VIII.

CHAPTER XXIV

Spain and Portugal Since 1823

There is no satisfactory history of Spain in the nineteenth century in English. Butler Clarke's *Modern Spain, 1815-1898,* is the fullest, but is overloaded with details, not effectively presented. Pages 91-470 cover the period of this chapter. A bibliography is appended. Hume, *Modern Spain, 1788-1898* (1899), is a shorter and more interesting account; pages 248-563 treat the period 1823-1898. There are brief chapters in *Cambridge Modern History,* vol. X, chap. VII, and vol. XI, chap. XX, bringing the history down to 1871.

Hubbard, *Histoire contemporaine de l'Espagne,* 6 vols. (1869-1883), is useful, treating the period 1814 to 1868. Vols. III and IV cover the years 1833 to 1843, and vols. V and VI the reign of Isabella II, 1843-1868. Yves Guyot, *L'Évolution politique et sociale de l'Espagne* (1899), is mainly a description of social, political, and economic conditions, not a history.

In German, see, Baumgarten, H., *Geschichte Spaniens vom Ausbruch der französischen Revolution bis auf unsere Tage,* 3 vols., (1865-1871). Vol. II treats of the restoration of Ferdinand, the revolution of 1820, and the subsequent intervention (1814-1825); vol. III, the remainder of Ferdinand's reign and the Carlist wars. A more recent German work is Gustav Diercks, *Geschichte Spaniens von der frühesten Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart,* 2 vols. (1895-1896); pp. 544-674 concern our period. E. H. Strobel, *The Spanish Revolution, 1868-1875* (Boston, 1898), is a clear and comprehensive account of the parliamentary history of Spain during the six years from the overthrow of Isabella II to the restoration of Alfonso XII. The book also throws much light on the manipulation of parliamentary institutions in Spain. H. Remsen Whitehouse, *The Sacrifice of a Throne* (1897), is the best description we have of the election, reign, and abdication of Amadeo of Savoy. Hannay, D., *Don Emilio Castelar* (1896), a life of the republican leader. On the colonies: see, J. W. Root, *Spain and Its Colonies* (1898); Zimmermann, A., *Die europäischen Kolonien,* vol. I, Die Kolonialpolitik Portugals und Spaniens (1899); H. W. Wilson, *The Downfall of Spain* (1900), is a naval history of the Spanish-American war of 1898.

On constitutional history: see, Gmelin, *Studien zur spanischen Verfassungsgeschichte des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Stuttgart, 1905); also, J. L. M. Curry, *Constitutional Government in Spain* (1899). Curry was United States Minister to Spain from 1885 to 1889. The constitution itself is in Dodd, *Modern Constitutions,* vol. II. On Portugal in the nineteenth century, there is a slight sketch of the years 1815 to 1880 in H. Morse Stephens, *Portugal* (Story of the Nations Series, 1891), pp. 409-432; see, also, chapters in *Cambridge Modern History* cited above. On the colonies: see, Zimmermann, op. cit.; G. M. Theal, *The Portuguese in South Africa* (1896).

CHAPTER XXV

Holland and Belgium Since 1830

For Holland and Belgium: consult, *Cambridge Modern History,* vol. X, chap. XVI, and vol. XI, chap. XXIII; Lavisse et Rambaud, *Histoire générale,* vol. X, chap. IX, vol. XI, chap. XI, vol. XII, chap. VI; also, Seignobos, *Political History of Europe Since 1814,* chap. VIII. The best history of Holland in the last century is in Dutch and has not yet been translated: Blok, *Geschiedenis van het Nederlandsche Volk;* vol.

VII (1907) covers the French period and the history of the United Netherlands to the secession of Belgium; vol. VIII (1908) continues the narrative down to the opening of the twentieth century; an impartial, critical, scientific work, containing much more than simply political history. Clive Day, *The Policy and Administration of the Dutch in Java* (1904), is a book of the first importance. On Belgium: see, Smythe, C., *The Story of Belgium* (Story of the Nations Series, 1900); T. Juste, *Léopold I, Roi des Belges, d'après les documents inédits,* 2 vols. (1868); Bertrand, L., *Léopold II et son règne 1865-1890* (Brussels, 1890); Wilmotte, M., *La Belgique morale et politique, 1830-1890* (Brussels, 1902); MacDonnell, J. de C., *King Leopold II, His Rule in Belgium and the Congo* (London, 1905); Bertrand, L., *Histoire de la démocratie et du socialisme en Belgique depuis 1830,* 2 vols. (Brussels, 1907); comes down to 1905; Flandin, E., *Institutions politiques de l'Europe contemporaine* (Paris, 1907), vol. I, pp. 160-307; Banning, E., *La Belgique au point de vue militaire et internationale* (Brussels, 1901); Dupriez, Léon, *L'organisation du suffrage universel en Belgique. Vote plural, vote obligatoire, représentation proportionelle* (Paris, 1901). Constitution of Belgium in Dodd, *Modern Constitutions,* vol. I.

CHAPTER XXVI

Switzerland

There are in English only brief accounts of Swiss history since 1815. See, *Cambridge Modern History,* vol. XI, chap. VIII, down to 1874; Seignobos, *Political History of Europe Since 1814,* chap. IX; Hug and Stead, *Switzerland* (Story of the Nations Series, 1890), pp. 382-421; comes down to 1889. McCracken, W. D., *The Rise of the Swiss Republic* (2nd edit., 1901), pp. 319-372; see, also, Baker, F. G., *The Model Republic. A History of the Rise and Progress of the Swiss People* (1895), pp. 462-538. The most important work is Seippel, Paul, *La Suisse au dix-neuvième siècle,* 3 vols. (Lausanne, 1899-1900). A co-operative work by a group of Swiss writers. The section on the political history of Switzerland in the nineteenth century, vol. I, pp. 51-378, is by Numa Droz, a former President of the Confederation. The work also contains very valuable chapters on the history of institutions, on constitutional, civil, and criminal law,, on the international rôle of Switzerland, on education, religion, economic history, arts, etc. Karl Dändliker, *A Short History of Switzerland,* translated by E. Salisbury (London, 1899), has a section covering the period 1813-1874, pp. 237-294. On Swiss political institutions, the best book in English is J. M. Vincent, *Government in Switzerland* (1900); contains the federal constitution and an excellent critical chapter on the literature of the subject. Borgeaud, C., *Adoption and Amendment of Constitutions,* translated by C. D. Hazen (1895), pp. 258-332, is important for the evolution of Swiss constitutional law. Lowell, A. L., *Governments and Parties in Continental Europe,* vol. II, chaps. XI-XIII, contains an admirable description of the political institutions of Switzerland and of the party history after 1848. Other books descriptive of Swiss institutions are: Adams, F. O., and Cunningham, C. D., *The Swiss Confederation* (1889); Winchester, B., *The Swiss Republic* (1891); Lloyd, H. D., and Hobson, J. A., *A Sovereign People; a Study of Swiss Democracy* (1907). An interesting study of democratic government in one of the *Landesgemeinde* cantons is I. B. Richman's *Appenzell, Pure Democracy and Pastoral Life in Inner Rhoden* (1895). Contains chapters on politics, laws, administration, cantonal and domestic economy, education,

charities, etc. Useful for the study of the referendum, is Deploige, *The Referendum in Switzerland,* translated by C. P. Trevelyan (London, 1898); by a Belgian lawyer. W. H. Dawson, *Social Switzerland, Studies of Present Day Social Movements and Legislation in the Swiss Republic* (London, 1897); contains chapters on the organization and protection of labor, on industrial peace, the problem of the unemployed, poor law agencies, technical education, control of the liquor traffic.

CHAPTER XXVII

The Scandinavian States

There is very little in English on the subject of this chapter. Useful brief accounts are to be found in Bain, R. N., *Scandinavia, A Political History of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, from 1513 to 1900* (Cambridge, 1905); chap. XVI concerns Denmark since 1814; chap. XVII, Sweden and Norway since 1814; *Cambridge Modern History,* vol. XI, chap. XXIV, Scandinavia 1815-1870; Seignobos, *Political History of Europe,* chap. XVIII; Lavisse et Rambaud, *Histoire générale,* vol. X, chap. XVIII; vol. XI, chap. XII; vol. XII, chap. VII, give an excellent, though brief narrative, covering the period 1815-1900. H. H. Boyesen, *The History of Norway* (Story of the Nations Series, 1886), pp. 516-538. On the Norwegian-Swedish crisis: see, Fridtjof Nansen's *Norway and the Union with Sweden* (London, 1905); an historical sketch from the Treaty of Kiel, 1814, through the dissolution of the Union; presents the Norwegian side. K. Nordlund, *The Swedish-Norwegian Union Crisis, A History with Documents* (Stockholm, 1905), presents the Swedish side and criticises Nansen. Consult, also, Mohn, A., *La Suède et la révolution norvégienne* (Paris, 1905); Fahlbeck, P., *La constitution suédoise et le parlementarisme moderne* (Paris, 1905), a brief sketch of Swedish constitutional history and government. The constitutions of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, are in Dodd, *Modern Constitutions.* Much useful, miscellaneous information is contained in Sundbärg, *Sweden, Its People and Industries* (1900); Weitemeyer, H., *Denmark* (London, 1891); and Carlsen, Olrik, and Starcke, *Le Danemark, État actuel de sa civilisation et de son organisation sociale* (Copenhagen, 1900); a work published on the occasion of the Universal Exposition at Paris in 1900.

CHAPTER XXVIII

The Disruption of the Ottoman Empire and the Rise of the Balkan States

There is no adequate treatment in English of the Eastern Question in its entirety. An admirable French book is Édouard Driault, *La question d'Orient depuis ses origines jusqu'à nos jours* (2nd edit., Paris, 1900), a book that may be cordially recommended to any one desiring a guide to a very complicated and widely ramified branch of history. The author's conception of the Eastern Question is large, including not only the fate of the Ottoman Empire in Europe, but the decline of Islam in Europe, Asia, and Africa. After a brief sketch of the Byzantine and Latin Empires, the conquests of the Turks, Driault traces the history of the Eastern Question in the eighteenth century, Napoleon's Oriental projects, the Greek war of independence, the internal reforms in Turkey, the Crimean war and its consequences, the war in the Balkans, the rise of the various states. Recent phases of the

general problem are then treated: the Armenian Massacres, the Cretan problem, the Greco-Turkish war, the Macedonian question, and the relations of Occidental powers with Islam in Asia and Africa. The chief merit of the work lies, not in research, but in the orderly and effective arrangement and presentation of a mass of widely scattered information. The book contains useful bibliographical references to important secondary material.

There is a useful though limited bibliography on the Eastern Question by Georges Bengesco, *Essai d'une notice bibliographique sur la question d'Orient. Orient Européen, 1821-1897* (Brussels, 1897). This concerns only the question of Europe in Turkey and is limited to works published in France and Belgium. Bengesco was formerly Roumanian minister to Belgium. T. E. Holland, *The European Concert in the Eastern Question,* contains many treaties, etc., bearing on the general question (1885).

On the Greek war of independence, there is a long and interesting chapter, sketching the Greek renaissance and describing vividly the military and diplomatic aspects of the stirring story in Fyffe, *History of Modern Europe,* vol. II, chap. IV (or chap. XV, in the one volume edition). W. Allison Phillips, *The War of Greek Independence* (1897), treats the years 1821 to 1833. Having no adequate introduction, the book lacks background, but the narrative of events is full, fair, and interesting. It is not based upon original investigation but upon works of Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, Finlay, Gordon, and Prokesch-Osten. Finlay, G., *History of the Greek Revolution,* is an important account, drawn largely upon the author's first hand knowledge of events. Tozer's edition, 1877, is the best as representing Finlay's matured views. The *Letters and Journals of Samuel Gridley Howe,* edited by his daughter, Laura E. Richards, are very valuable; vol. I, entitled *The Greek Revolution* (Boston, 1906), throws a flood of light upon the course of the war. The volume is based almost entirely upon the journal of Howe, who, graduating from Brown University in 1821, and from Harvard Medical School in 1824, went immediately to Greece, joined the Greek army, created a surgical corps and also distinguished himself as a commander. His journal, though marked by serious gaps, is a vivid historical source for the years 1825 to 1829. Howe's volume called, *Sketch of the Greek Revolution,* published in 1828, also abounds in graphic descriptions at first hand of men and events. Interesting sidelights on the Greek war are also to be found in the works of Lord Byron, *Letters and Journals,* vol. VI, edited by Rowland E. Prothero (London, 1904).

Perhaps the most important recent account of this whole chapter of Greek history is in Stern, *Geschichte Europas,* vol. II, chaps. VII and XIV; vol. III, chaps. IV-VI; vol. IV, chap. X.

On the Crimean War: see, Walpole, *History of England Since 1815,* vol. VI, chap. XXIV; McCarthy, *History of Our Own Times,* vol. I, chaps. XXV-XXVIII; Paul, *History of Modern England,* vol. I, chaps. XVII-XIX, and vol. II, chap. I. Paul's characterization of Napoleon III is so overdone as to approach the ridiculous. Kinglake's monumental *Invasion of the Crimea* (8 vols., 1863-1887) is a brilliant performance in a way, picturesque and full of detail, but is frequently amusingly portentous and Homeric in tone; is marked by a pronounced dislike of Napoleon III; and is, moreover, incomplete, stopping at the death of Lord Raglan. Probably the most informing and most interesting account, judicial as well, is that of Gorce in his *Histoire du Second Empire,* vol. I, pp. 134-481, a masterly piece of exposition. An important phase of this war is well treated by H. Friedjung in *Der Krimkrieg und die oesterreichische Politik* (1907), a clear, scientific analysis of the

peculiarly involved and difficult foreign relations of Austria during the years 1853-1856; a purely diplomatic study. An excellent brief treatment of the diplomacy of the period is contained in ANDREWS, *Historical Development of Modern Europe,* vol. II, chap. II.

On the re-opening of the Eastern Question, the war in the Balkans and the Congress of Berlin: WALPOLE, *History of Twenty-five Years,* vol. IV, chaps. XVII and XVIII; PAUL, *History of Modern England,* vol. IV, chaps. I and II; MCCARTHY, *History of Our Own Times,* vol. II, chaps. LXIV and LXV; ROSE, *The Development of the European Nations,* vol. I, chaps. VII-IX (includes a clear account of the Russo-Turkish campaign); HANOTAUX, *Contemporary France,* vol. IV, chaps. II and V; DEBIDOUR, *Histoire diplomatique,* vol. II, chap. XIII; BOURGEOIS, E., *Manuel historique de politique étrangère,* vol. III, pp. 783-815; MORLEY, *Life of Gladstone,* vol. II, pp. 548-583; BISMARCK, *Reflections and Reminiscences,* vol. II, chap. XXVIII; SKRINE, *Expansion of Russia,* pp. 243-265; SERGEANT, L., *Greece in the Nineteenth Century,* pp. 270-307; WHITMAN, S., *Reminiscences of the King of Roumania,* chaps. VIII-XI.

On Bulgaria since 1878: see, ROSE, *Development of the European Nations,* vol. I, chap. X; MILLER, W., *The Balkans* (Story of the Nations Series), pp. 215-248 (comes down to 1896); A. H. BEAMAN, *Stambuloff* (1895); E. DICEY, *The Peasant State* (1894); ODYSSEUS (Sir C. Eliot), *Turkey in Europe.*

On Roumanian history: see, WHITMAN, *Reminiscences of the King of Roumania,* chap. XI; FRÉDÉRIC DAMÉ, *Histoire de la Roumanie contemporaine depuis l'avènement des princes indigènes jusqu'à nos jours. 1822-1900* (Paris, 1900); BELLESORT, A., *La Roumanie contemporaine* (Paris, 1905), a book of travel; G. BENGER, *Roumania in 1900,* translated by A. H. KEENE (London, 1900), with bibliography; contains chapters on history, political organizations, commerce, religion, art, etc.; A. DE BERTHA, *Magyars et Roumains devant l'histoire* (Paris, 1899); ELIADE, P., *Histoire de l'esprit public en Roumanie au XIXe siècle* (Paris, 1905); FISHER, E., *Die Herkunft der Rumänen* (Bamberg, 1904); GEORGES BENGESCO, *Bibliographie Franco-Roumaine, depuis le commencement du XIXe siècle jusqu'à nos jours* (Paris, 1907), a list of works edited or published in France concerning Roumania, French works published by Roumanian authors, doctoral theses sustained by Roumanians down to 1894 before French faculties.

On Servian history: see, MILLER, *The Balkans,* part III, chap. VII; very brief. Miller's book in general is very inadequate on period since 1878; P. COQUELLE, *Le Royaume de Serbie* (Paris, 1901). Covers the history from 610 A. D. down; pp. 215-298 concern the nineteenth century from 1815 to 1900.

On Greece under Otto: see, SERGEANT, L., *Greece in the Nineteenth Century* (1897), pp. 218-258; FINLAY, G., *History of the Greek Revolution,* book V, chap. IV (down to 1843). On reign of George I: see, SERGEANT, *Greece in the Nineteenth Century,* pp. 258-395. BICKFORD-SMITH, R. A. H., *Greece Under King George* (1893), is not a history but a description of economic conditions, education, army and navy, constitution, etc. On Greece: see, also, SIR RICHARD C. JEBB's *Modern Greece.* Two lectures with papers on The Progress of Greece and Byron in Greece (1880), 2nd edition published in 1901.

On Turkey in the nineteenth century: see, SEIGNOBOS, *Political History of Europe Since 1814,* chap. XX; S. LANE-POOLE, *Turkey* (Story of the Nations Series, 1888), pp. 340-365; ODYSSEUS (Sir C. Eliot), *Turkey in Europe* (1900); VILLARI, editor, *The Balkan Question* (1905); BRAILSFORD, H. N., *Macedonia, Its Races and Their Future* (1906); W. M. RAMSEY, *Impressions of Turkey.* On recent events: see, BARTON, *Day-*

break in Turkey (Boston, 1909); C. R. Buxton, *Turkey in Revolution* (London, 1909); G. F. Abbott, *Turkey in Transition* (1909).

CHAPTER XXIX

Russia to the War with Japan

The best history of Russia in English covering our period is Skrine, F. H., *Expansion of Russia, 1815-1900* (1903); clear and free from partisanship; contains maps and bibliography. Rambaud, *History of Russia from the Earliest Times to 1877*, translated by L. B. Lang, 2 vols., vol. II, pp. 200-285, is useful. Rambaud's work was pronounced by Turgenieff "superior to any other history accessible to Western Europe." Rambaud, *The Expansion of Russia, Problems of the East and Problems of the Far East* (Burlington, Vt., 1900), a very useful résumé of the Russian advance into Asia. Morfill, W. R. A., *History of Russia from the Birth of Peter the Great to the Death of Alexander II* (1902), contains a good deal of information, poorly presented. Pages 342-471 cover the years from 1815 to 1898. By the same author, *Russia* (Story of the Nations Series, 1890), chaps. XI-XIV.

On the reign of Alexander I, the most important work is T. Schiemann, *Russland unter Nikolaus I*, vol. I. This volume treats the reign of Alexander I, though not fully. Chap. IX, pp. 351-487, is a remarkably fine chapter on the conditions of Russia at that time. There are also chapters on Polish questions and a sketch of the career of Nicholas before his accession. Stern, *Geschichte Europas*, vol. III, chap. I, has a valuable survey of the last ten years of Alexander's reign; consult, also, C. Joyneville, *Life and Times of Alexander I*, 3 vols. (1875).

On Nicholas I: Schiemann, work cited, vol. II, covers the five years 1825 to 1830, and contains many important documents; Stern, *Geschichte Europas*, vol. III, chap. II; on the beginning of the reign, 1825-1827; Bernhardi, T., *Unter Nikolaus und Friedrich Wilhelm IV* (1893); Thouvenel, L., *Nicholas et Napoléon III, 1852-1854* (1891); Haxthausen, *Étude sur les institutions nationales de la Russie*, translated from the German, 3 vols. (1847-1853); important for its description of the mir. On the reforms of Alexander II: see, Sir Donald Mackenzie Wallace, *Russia* (revised edition, 1905), chaps. XXVII-XXXIII; Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu, *The Empire of the Tsars and the Russians*, translated by Z. A. Ragozin, 3 vols. (1893-1896); vol. I devoted to the country and the people; vol. II to institutions; vol. III to religion and church affairs. These two are the best general descriptions of Russia and contain a great deal of history. See, also, for the reforms: Maxime Kovalevsky, *Russian Political Institutions* (Chicago, 1902), chaps. VI-IX. On social unrest and nihilism: Wallace, chap. XXXIV; Leroy-Beaulieu, vol. II, Book VI; A. Thun, *Geschichte der revolutionären Bewegungen in Russland* (1883)—covers the period from 1863 to 1880 and has a good bibliography. The writings of a Russian refugee, Stepniak (pseudonym), *Underground Russia* (1882), *The Russian Peasant* (1888), are important, as describing conditions and state of mind of the masses; also, Gogol, *Dead Souls*.

On the reign of Alexander III: see, H. von Samson-Himmelstierna, *Russia Under Alexander III* (1897); Charles Lowe, *Alexander III* (1895); E. Flourens, *Alexander III* (1894); George Kennan, *Siberia and the Exile System*, 2 vols. (4th edit., 1897); Pobyedonostseff, K. P., *Reflections of a Russian Statesman* (London, 1898).

On the reign of Nicholas II: consult, Wallace, *Russia*, chaps. XXXVI-XXXIX; Pierre Leroy-Beaulieu, *The Awakening of*

The East, Siberia, Japan, China (1900); for a description of the development of Siberia: Vladimir, *Russia on the Pacific, and the Siberian Railway* (1899); M. M. Shoemaker, *The Great Siberian Railway* (1903); G. F. Wright, *Asiatic Russia,* 2 vols. (1902); A. Krausse, *Russia in Asia* (1899), strongly partisan, Russophobe; Combes de Lestrade, *La Russie économique et sociale à l'avènement de S. M. Nicholas II* (1896); M. Kovalevsky, *Le régime économique de la Russie* (1898), and W. de Kovalewsky, *L'Agriculture en Russie* (1897) and *La Russie à la fin du XIX^e siècle* (1900); Geoffrey Drage, *Russian Affairs* (1904). Stepniak, *King Log and King Stork, a Study of Modern Russia,* 2 vols. (1895), and Prince Kropotkin, *Memoirs of a Revolutionist,* 2 vols. (1899), throw much light on conditions of Russian life.

On Poland: see, Morfill, *Poland* (1893), (Story of the Nations Series), chaps. XII-XIV, and Brandes, G. M. C., *Poland, A Study of the Land, People, and Literature* (1903), a recent book by a Danish literary critic; Kovalevsky, M., *Russian Political Institutions,* chap. X.

On Finland: J. R. Fisher, *Finland and the Tsars, 1809-1899* (London, 1899); F. Moreau, *La question finlandaise* (1900); H. de Wundt, *Finland as It Is* (London, 1901); Kovalevsky, M., *Russian Political Institutions,* chap. XI. H. Norman, *All the Russias* (1902), presents the Russian side of the Finnish question, pp. 84-95.

CHAPTER XXX

The Far East

The best English book on the relations between Europe and the East is Sir Robert K. Douglas, *Europe and the Far East* (1904); contains a bibliography; treats of the opening of China and Japan to Western influences, the rise and re-organization of Japan, the Asiatic wars with European powers, the Chino-Japanese war, the Boxer insurrection, etc.; comes down to the outbreak of the Russo-Japanese war. An admirable French book is Édouard Driault, *La Question d'Extrême Orient* (1908); studies Chinese and Japanese civilizations, the history of the relations of Asia with Europe from the sixteenth to the twentieth century, gives an account of the Chino-Japanese and the Russo-Japanese wars and describes the present situation. Pierre Leroy-Beaulieu, *The Awakening of the East* (1900), comes down to 1899 and contains a good chapter on Japan (pp. 81-182), and on China (pp. 183-289). For a briefer treatment: see, *Cambridge Modern History,* vol. XI, chap. XXVIII. The Library of Congress published (Washington, 1904) a *Select List of Books Relating to the Far East.*

On the opening of China: see, Reinsch, P. S., *World Politics* (1900), pp. 86-257, very clear and illuminating; Colquhoun, A. R., *China in Transformation* (1898); Smith, A. H., *China in Convulsion,* 2 vols. (1901), by an American, long a missionary in China; Brown, A. J., *New Forces in Old China* (1904); Martin, W. A. P., *The Awakening of China* (1907). Cordier, H., *Histoire des relations de la Chine avec les puissances occidentales,* 2 vols. (1901-1902), covers the period since 1860. A. H. Smith's *Chinese Characteristics* (1890) is a very informing book by one who is recognized as an authority on China. Morse, H. M., *The Trade and Administration of the Chinese Empire* (1908), by a Harvard graduate, for thirty-three years resident in China.

On Japan: see, Murray, D., *The Story of Japan* (1894), chaps. XIII-XV; Griffis, W. E., *Life of Matthew Calbraith Perry* (1887), *The Mikado's Empire* (10th edit., 1903); *The Japanese Nation in Evolution*

(1907); describes recent events; Iyenaga, *The Constitutional Development of Japan* (Johns Hopkins University Studies, Baltimore, 1891); Gollier, Théophile, *Essai sur les institutions politiques du Japon* (Brussels, 1903), a good account of the Japanese government; Knox, G. W., *Imperial Japan* (1905). On the causes of the Russo-Japanese war: see, Asakawa, *The Russo-Japanese Conflict* (1904). For a list of books on the Russo-Japanese war: see, *Statesman's Year Book* for 1908, p. 1223. An important book is Hershey, A. S., *The International Law and Diplomacy of the Russo-Japanese War* (1906); contains, among others, excellent chapters on the causes of the war and on the Treaty of Portsmouth.

A very interesting account by a participant in one of the great events of the war is Capt. Vladimir Semenoff, *The Battle of Tsu-shima between the Japanese and Russian Fleets, Fought on 27th of May, 1905.* Translated by A. B. Lindsay (London, 1906, 165 pp.).

Millard, T. A., *The New Far East* (1907); an examination of the present situation of Japan and her relation to the Far Eastern Question, with special reference to the interests of the United States and the future of China; contains chapters on Japan in Korea, in Manchuria, the New China, Japan, China and the West; contains, also, the Anglo-Japanese Alliance of 1905, the Treaty of Portsmouth, the Japanese-Korean Agreement of 1905.

Dyer, Henry, *Japan in World Politics* (1909), by a professor emeritus in the University of Tokio; has chapters on the Meeting of the Far East and the West, on the Rise of Japan as a World Power, on the Factors of National Life, on the Civilizations of the East and the West, etc.

There are many important articles on Japan in the *Encyclopedia Americana,* written by Japanese specialists.

CHAPTER XXXI

Russia Since the War with Japan

The most useful description of the events of this period will be found in the *Annual Register.* Dodd, *Modern Constitutions,* gives the Fundamental Laws of the Russian Empire of May 6th, 1906, with useful notes. Harper, S. N., *The New Electoral Law for the Russian Duma* (Chicago, 1908), is an excellent description of the present electoral law. Milyoukov, Paul, *Russia and Its Crisis* (Chicago, 1905), presents the Liberal theory of the crisis: a very instructive book, but confessedly one-sided. Victor Bérard, *The Russian Empire and Czarism,* translated by G. Fox-Davies and G. O. Pope (1905), has certain chapters describing the process of Russification attempted with the Poles, Jews, Finns, and Armenians. Other books that may be consulted are: Pares, B., *Russia and Reform* (1907); Nevinson, H. W., *The Dawn in Russia* (1906); Perris, G. H., *Russia in Revolution* (1905); Martin, R., *The Future of Russia* (1906).

CHAPTER XXXII

Certain Features of Modern Progress

Interesting volumes treating briefly certain general features of the last century, literature, science, art, industry, transportation, etc., are: *The Progress of the Century,* by A. R. Wallace and others (1901); *The Nineteenth Century: A Review of Progress* (1901); Wallace, A. R.,

The Wonderful Century: Its Successes and Its Failures (1898). Day's *History of Commerce* (1907) treats liberally the nineteenth century, and has an admirable bibliography fully opening up the subject; Cochrane, *Modern Industrial Progress* (1904), is useful.

Probably the most satisfactory general survey of the world to-day, from the political and economic point of view, is É. Driault, *Le monde actuel* (1909), an account of very recent history of the different countries, and a description of present conditions and tendencies; clear, suggestive, interesting. Another book by the same author is *Les problèmes politiques et sociaux à la fin du XIX^e siècle* (1900). Vol. VII of Larned's *History for Ready Reference* is announced. It will cover the first decade of the twentieth century and ought to prove useful for recent history.

On the peace movement: see, Holls, F. W., *The Peace Conference at the Hague, and Its Bearings on International Law and Policy* (1900); an account of the First Conference of 1899 by a member of the delegation of the United States; Hull, W. I., *The Two Hague Conferences and Their Contributions to International Law* (1908), a comparative study of the discussions and achievements of the Conferences of 1899 and 1907, well arranged and clearly presented; Scott, J. B., *The Hague Peace Conferences of 1899 and 1907,* two elaborate and authoritative volumes (1909). Vol. I consists of lectures delivered at Johns Hopkins University by Scott, one of the delegates of the United States at the conference of 1907, lectures now much revised and enlarged; vol. II contains the official documents, the instructions to American delegates, their official reports, and the various texts drawn up at the Conferences and ratified by the participating powers; Higgins, A. P., *The Hague Peace Conferences and the Other International Conferences Concerning the Laws and Usages of War* (Cambridge University Press, 1909); Foster, J. W., *Arbitration and the Hague Court* (1904).

For current history, the most useful aids are the various annuals published in different countries: in England, the *Annual Register,* published since 1758; in France, Viallate, A., *La vie politique dans les deux mondes,* since 1907; in Germany, Schiemann, T., *Deutschland und die grosse Politik,* since 1902; Glaser, F. W., *Wirtschaftspolitische Annalen,* since 1906; Schulthess, *Europäischer Geschichtskalender,* since 1860; Aegidi and Klauhold, *Das Staatsarchiv. Sammlung der offiziellen Aktenstücke zur Geschichte der Gegenwart,* since 1861. Now edited by G. Roloff.

An annual that seems likely to prove most useful is the *Jahrbuch der Zeit- und Kulturgeschichte,* containing chapters on the political life of Germany and other countries, on the religious life, on economic, educational, literary, and scientific matters, and on art and music. Edited by Dr. Franz Schnürer. The first volume, that concerning the year 1907, was published in Freiburg in 1908.

Several special encyclopædias are of importance to the student of history: Palgrave, *Dictionary of Political Economy,* 3 vols. (1900); Conrad, *Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften,* 7 vols. (2nd edit., 1898-1901); Marquardsen, *Handbuch des öffentlichen Rechts der Gegenwart in Monographien,* 5 vols. (1883-1906). What amounts to a new edition is announced under the title *Das öffentliche Recht der Gegenwart.* There are certain monographs of value to the historian in *Staats-und sozialwissenschaftliche Forschungen,* edited by Gustav Schmoller und Max Sering.

The Statesman's Year Book is an indispensable source of varied statistical information, concerning all countries. On various aspects of government and politics: see, Goodnow, F. J., *Comparative Administrative Law,* 2 vols. (1893), a study of the administrative systems of

Germany, France, England, and the United States; Burgess, J. W., *Political Science and Comparative Constitutional Law*, 2 vols. (1890), a study of the governments of Germany, France, England, and the United States; Shaw, Albert, *Municipal Government in Great Britain* (1895), and *Municipal Government in Continental Europe* (1895); Munro, W. B., *The Government of European Cities* (1909); Meyer, G., *Das parlamentarische Wahlrecht* (1901), chiefly an account of the suffrage in Europe in the nineteenth century; Lefévre-Pontalis, *Les élections en Europe à la fin du XIX^e siècle* (1902), treats of the electoral qualifications and modes of election in the various countries of Europe; Pyfferoen, O., *L'électorat politique et administratif en Europe* (1903), another account of the various electoral systems.

Publications which will be found useful in the study of contemporary history, besides the more popular English and American reviews, such as the *Fortnightly; Contemporary; Nineteenth Century; Westminster; North American; Forum; Review of Reviews;* are: the *Edinburgh Review; Quarterly Review; National Review; American Political Science Review; Political Science Quarterly; Yale Review; Annals of the American Academy; Economic Journal; Economic Review; Quarterly Journal of Economics; Socialist Review; Survey; Law Quarterly Review; American Journal of International Law; Revue des deux mondes; Revue de Paris; Revue bleue; Le Correspondant; Revue d'histoire diplomatique; Revue politique et parlementaire; Revue de droit international et de législation comparée; Archives diplomatiques; Revue de droit public et science politique; Annales des sciences politiques; Questions diplomatiques et coloniales; Revue générale de droit international public; Journal des économistes; Revue d'économie politique; Revue économique internationale; L'économiste français; Deutsche Rundschau; Preussische Jahrbücher; Jahrbuch des öffentlichen Rechts; Archiv für öffentliches Recht; Zeitschrift für Völkerrecht und Bundesstaatsrecht.*

INDEX

Abbas II, Khedive of Egypt, 558
Abd-el-Kader, native leader in Algeria, 373
Abdul Aziz, Sultan, recognizes the Union of Moldavia and Wallachia, *1862*, 618; deposed March, *1876*, 621
Abdul Hamid II, *1876-1909*, accession of, 621; war with Russia and Treaty of San Stefano, 623-624; cedes Thessaly to Greece *(1881)*, 634; and Crete, 635; restores constitution of *1876*, 636, 637; deposition of, 643
Abdul Medjid, Sultan, and the Crimean War, 612-616
Abyssinia, Italian war with, 382-384
Accident Insurance Laws (Germany), *1884* and *1885*, 316
Achmet Agha, and the attack on Batak, 621-622
Act of Federation (German), work of the Congress of Vienna, 29-31; von Sybel's estimate of, 32; unsatisfactory to Germans, 32; Article XIII of, 35, 38
Act of Union *(1800)*, Great Britain and Ireland, 497
Adana, in Asia Minor, massacres in *(1909)*, 642
Adrianople, Treaty of *(1829)*, 611; entered by Russians *(1878)*, 624; 642
Afghanistan, war in, 490; protectorate of England over, 523; as a buffer between India and Turkestan, 682
Africa, German trading stations in, 318; German colonies in, 319; Senegal, French possession *(1815)* in, 371; French conquest of Algeria, 372; other French conquests in, 373-375; Western, 374; Italian possessions in, 382; slavery in the English colonies of, 439, abolished, 440; war in South *(1899-1902)*, 490, 512, 529; British South Africa, 536-
Africa, *continued*
545; partition of, 550-563; period of discovery in, 550-551; situation in *(1815)*, 551; French conquest of Algeria, 552; English explorations in, 552-553; European appropriations of *(1884-1890)*, 554; conference of the Powers concerning *(1876)*, 554; International African Association, 554; Congo Free State, 554-557; Egypt, 557-563; Spanish possessions in, 574; Portuguese possessions in, 578; possessions of the Ottoman Empire *(1815)* in, 601. *See* British South Africa, German East and German Southwest Africa, Western Africa
African Association, International, 554; becomes International Association of the Congo, 555
Aix-la-Chapelle, Congress of *(1818)*, 59; 75
Alabama award, 486, 528, 591
Albania, 602
Albert Nyanza, 552
Albert of Saxe-Coburg, Prince Consort, marriage of, to Queen Victoria *(1840)*, 445
Albert I, King of Belgium, *1909—*, 583
Alberta, admitted to the Dominion of Canada, *1905*, 529
Alessandria, 61
Alexander of Battenberg *(1879)*, Prince of Bulgaria, 628; abdicates, 630
Alexander I, King of Servia, *1889-1903*, murder of, 633
Alexander I, Tsar of Russia, *1801-1825*, and Bernadotte, 2; demands of, at the Congress of Vienna, 6; Treaty of Holy Alliance, 14, 16; character of, 19; becomes conservative, 38, 40; and Charles X, 92; and the Belgian revolution, 104; and Poland *(1815)*, 107, 647-648; reign of, 645-650; training of, 646; posi-

Alexander I, *continued*
tion of, in *1815*, 647; progressive domestic policy of, 648; liberal foreign policy of, 649; becomes reactionary *(1820-1825)*, 108, 649; death of *(1825)*, 609, 650
Alexander II, Tsar of Russia, *1855-1881*, attitude of, toward the Prussian annexations, 268 and note; and the Congress of Berlin, 320; alliance of the Three Emperors, 321, 616; and the Crimean War, 616; attitude toward Turkey, *1876*, 623; declares war against Turkey *(1877)*, 623; accession and liberalism, 655; prevailing system of land tenure under, the mir, the serfs, 655-657; issues Edict of Emancipation *(1861)*, 657; and the land problem, 657-660; establishes zemstvos *(1864)*, 660; reforms the judicial system, 661; other reforms of, 661; and the Polish insurrection of *1863*, 662-663; and the Russification of Poland, 664-665; effect of the Polish insurrection upon, 665; becomes reactionary, 665; rise of Nihilism under, 666-668; attempts upon the life of, 669; assassination of *(1881)*, 670
Alexander III, Tsar of Russia, *1881-1894*, character and policy of, 670; influence of Pobyedonostseff upon, 670-671; persecution of the Jews under, 672; progressive features of the reign of, 673; industrial revolution under, 673-674; appoints Sergius de Witte, Minister of Commerce and Finance *(1892)*, his policy, 674-675; rise of labor problems, 675; rise of a rich bourgeoisie, 675; death *(1894)*, 676
Alexander John I of Roumania, rule of, 618; abdicates, 619. *See* Couza
Alexandria, 488, 559
Alfonso XII, King of Spain, *1874-1885*, becomes King, 572; and the Constitution of *1876*, 573; death of, 574
Alfonso XIII, King of Spain, born May 17, *1886*, assumes power *(1902)*, 575; marriage with Princess Ena of Battenberg, 575
Algeria, 98, *275*; Picquart sent to, 359; in *1815*, 551; French conquest of, 372, *552*
Algiers, conquered by France, 132, 372; in *1815*, 602
Ali of Janina, 602
Alma, battle of the, 614
Alsace, Germans invade, *296*; ceded to Germany by the Treaties of Versailles and Frankfort, 300, 303, 319, 337
Amadeo of Savoy chosen King of Spain, *1870*, 570; abdicates, 571
American Commonwealth, Bryce's, Censorship of, in Russia, 678
Amoy, opened to British trade by treaty of Nanking *(1842)*, 685
Amsterdam, 102
Amur, Russia acquires northern bank of the, from China, *1858*, 682
Ancona, seized by France, 111
Andalusia, 49
Anesthetics, discovery of, 720
Anglican Church. *See* Church of England
Anglo-Japanese Treaty of *1902*, 700
Angoulême, Duke of, leads French army in the invasion of Spain, *1823*, 63; 79; renounces claim to the crown, 97
Annam, French protectorate over *(1883)*, 373, 374
Anti-Corn-Law League *(1839)*, 452
Antiseptics, 720
Apulia, Riots in *(1889)*, 383
Arabi Pasha, revolt of, crushed by England, 559
Arabia, Ottoman Empire *(1815)* and, 601
Arbitration, Permanent Court of, established *(1899)*, 732, 736
Ardahan, 626
Argentina, Italian emigration to, 386
Argyll, Duke of, on the Land Act of *1881*, 491
Arkwright, 407, 722
Armaments, Cost of, 728; Nicholas II and the limitation of, 729
Armenia, Russia retains a part of Turkish, 626
Army Reforms, in France *(1818)*, 76; *(1872)*, 339; in Prussia, 248-249, *255*; in England, 481-482;

Army Reforms, *continued*
in Roumania, 632; in Turkey, 643; in Japan, 693; in China, 704
Arndt, 43; restored to professorship, 150
Artois, Count of (afterwards Charles X), leader of the Ultras in France in *1815*, 72, 74, 79; heads the party of reaction in France, 80. *See* Charles X
Ashley, Lord, and the child labor agitation, 442
Asia, French possessions in, 374; Portuguese possessions in, 578; Dutch possessions in, 581; Ottoman Empire in *(1815)*, 601; England, France, and Russia in, 681
Asia Minor, Mehemet Ali in, 131; part of the Ottoman Empire *(1815)*, 601; massacres in *(1909)*, 642
Asquith, Herbert, leader of the Liberal Party since *1908*, 515; and the Old Age Pensions Law, *1908*, 515; and the Irish University or Birrell Act, *1908*, 516
Associations, Law of, *1901*, (France), 366
Associations of Worship (France), *1905*, 369; Pius X and, 369
Athens, captured by the Turks, 607; made capital of Greece, 634
Auckland, 534
Augustenburg, Duke of, *259-260*
Ausgleich or Austro-Hungarian Compromise of *1867*, 393-396; renewed by arbitrary act of Francis Joseph I, 404
Australasia, 534, 545
Australia, Ballot system of, adopted in England, 484; English possessions in, prior to *1815*, 519; early explorations in, 530; voyages of Captain Cook to, 531; as a convict colony, 531; discovery of gold in *(1851* and *1852)*, 244, 532; the Six Colonies of, 532; creation of the Commonwealth of *(1890-1900)*, 533; the Federal Parliament in *(1901)*, 534; and the South African War, 544; autonomy in, 546; and the problem of Federation, 547-549; preferential tariffs, 548. *See* South Australia, Western Australia
Austria, acquires Lombardy and Venetia by Treaty of Paris, 3; Emperor of, at Congress of Vienna, 4; acquisitions by Congress of Vienna, 8-9; Holy Alliance, 14; signs Quadruple Alliance, 17; lack of unity in, 23-25; policy of Francis I and Metternich, 25-28; importance in the Diet, 30; jealousy of Prussia, 34; importance of the Carlsbad Conference to, 43; dominance of, in Italy, 53; at Congress of Troppau, 59; invades Italy, 60, 61; at Congress of Verona, 62; recognizes the Kingdom of Belgium, 105; and the revolution in Poland, 106-110; intervention in the Papal States, 111; and the revolution in Germany *(1830)*, 112; and Turkish affairs, 132; and the London Conference *(1840)*, 132; and the Zollverein, 149; *1815-1848*, 152-159; accession of Ferdinand I, 152; the industrial revolution in, 153; development of nationalities within the Empire—Bohemia, 153; Hungary, 154-159; and Young Italy, 163-166; Pius IX protests against occupation of Ferrara by, 166; Kossuth's speech against, 169; accepts Hungarian plan of autonomy, 171; grants autonomy to Bohemia, 172; Constitution for the Empire granted, 172; revolution in Lombardy-Venetia, 172; Italy renounces the control of, 173; March *(1848)* revolutions triumphant in, 174; begins the work of restoration, 175; riots in Prague, 175; conquers Bohemia, 175; partially conquers Italy, 175; exploits the situation in Hungary, 177; Ferdinand declares Hungarian Diet dissolved, 178; outbreak in Vienna, 178; flight of Ferdinand to Olmütz, 178; Windischgrätz conquers Vienna, 178; abdication of Ferdinand and accession of his nephew Francis Joseph I, who retracts the March Laws, 179; war with Hungary, 179; conquers Hungary, 180; completes conquest of Italy, 181; crushes Lom-

Austria, *continued*
bardy, 181; overthrows Sardinian army at Novara, 181; surrender of Venice to, 182; rejects the work of the Frankfort Parliament, 185; the "humiliation of Olmütz," 185; restores Diet of Frankfort *(1851)*, 185; reaction in Italy after *1848*, 215; indicted at Congress of Paris by Cavour, 220; conspiracy against, at Plombières, 223; Austro-Sardinian war, *225*; defeated at battles of Magenta and Solferino, *225*; peace concluded with France and Sardinia at Villafranca, *225*; to be a member of the projected Italian Confederation, 228; reaction in, *1850-1859*, 240; Bismarck's attitude toward, 253 and 254; with Prussia declares war against Denmark, 258; secures Schleswig-Holstein and Lauenburg in conjunction with Prussia by the Treaty of Vienna *(1864)*, 259, 593; convention of Gastein, 259; war with Prussia, 263; victories of Custozza and Lissa, 265; defeated by Prussia at Königgrätz, 265; causes of defeat of, 265; terms of peace with Prussia, 267; cedes Venetia to Italy, 267; neutrality of, in Franco-German war, 294; Austro-German treaty of *1879*, 321; Triple Alliance *(1882)*, 321, 382; Austria to the Compromise of *1867*, 388-396; punishment of Hungary *(1849)*, 388; constitution of *1849* revoked, 388; failure of the war in Italy *(1859)*, 389; forced to cede Lombardy to Piedmont, 389; becomes a constitutional state, 390; Hungary refuses to coöperate with, and demands the restoration of her constitution of *1848*, 390-392; deadlock with Hungary, *1861-1865*, 393; Francis Joseph I yields, 393; Compromise of *1867*, 393-396; constitution of, 395; Germans the dominant race in, 395; divisive effect of the principle of nationality in, 396; Empire of, since *1867*, 396-402; liberal legislation in, since *1867*, 396-397; demands of the Czechs, 397; opposition of Austrian Germans and Magyars, 398; electoral reform in, 399; composition of the Reichsrath, 399; the Taaffe ministry, *1879-1893*, 400; Slavs favored, 400; social legislation, 400; Workingmen's Insurance, 400; division among the Czechs, 401; fall of the Taaffe ministry, 401; electoral reform *(1896)*, 401; universal suffrage established *(1907)*, 402; signs Treaty of Paris *(1856)*, 616; joins England in demanding a revision of the Treaty of San Stefano, 625; by Congress of Berlin, *1878*, invited to "occupy and administer" Bosnia and Herzegovina, 320, 626; stops war between Bulgaria and Servia, 629; secret treaty with Russia, 640; attitude of, toward the breaches of the Berlin Treaty *(1878)*, 629, 640. *See* Austria-Hungary

Austria-Hungary, since *1849*, 388-405; Ausgleich, 393; the Delegations, 394; divisive effect of the principle of nationality in, 396; and Bosnia and Herzegovina, 404-405; at the Conference of the Powers *(1876)*, 554; at the Congress of Berlin *(1884-1885)*, 555; annexes Bosnia and Herzegovina, *1908*, 639-640, 644

Austro-German Treaty *(1879)*, 321

Austro-Hungarian War *(1849)*, 179-180

Austro-Prussian War *(1866)*, 263-267

Austro-Sardinian War *(1859)*, *225-227*

Azeglio. *See* D'Azeglio

Azores, part of the Kingdom of Portugal, 578

Baden, granted constitution *(1818)*, 37; supports Austria in the war of *1866*, 263; joins Prussia in the Franco-German War *(1870)*, 294

Baker, Sir Samuel, English explorer, discovers one source of the Nile, 552

Bakounine, and Socialism, 667

Balaklava, battle of, 614

Balbo, Cesare, *1789-1853*, author of "*Hopes of Italy*" *(1844)*, 165

Balfour, Arthur James, Chief Secretary for Ireland during the Second Salisbury Ministry *(1886-1892)*, policy of coercion in Ireland, 505; becomes Prime Minister *(1902)*, 511; on the death of Queen Victoria, 513
Balkan Peninsula, events in, *1876-1878*, 320; *1815*, part of the Ottoman Empire, 601
Balkan States, Rise of, 601-644
Ballot, Introduction of, in England by Ballot Law of *1872*, 483; Lord Palmerston on, 483; Gladstone on, 483; Morley on, 483
Baltic Provinces of Russia, 645, Russification of, 672
Baluchistan, England and, 523
Bangweolo, Lake, discovered by Livingstone, 552
Baratieri, Italian General, defeated by Menelek, 383
Barbary States, 372-373
Barcelona, 49
Bardine, Sophie, 668
Baring, Sir Evelyn, later Lord Cromer, communication to, from Lord Granville concerning England's position in Egypt, 560
Bashi-Bazouks, in the Bulgarian Atrocities, 621
Batak, atrocities in, 621-622
Batoum, 626
Battenberg, Princess Ena of, marries Alfonso XIII of Spain *(1906)*, 575; Alexander of, chosen Prince of Bulgaria *(1879)*, 628
Baudin, republican deputy, 281
Bavaria, King of, at Congress of Vienna, 4; importance of, in the Diet, 30; granted constitution *(1818)*, 37; economic growth of, *1849-1858*, 244; supports Austria in the War of *1866*, 263; army of, defeated at Kissingen, 265; joins Prussia in the Franco-Prussian War, 294; becomes part of the German Empire, 301; Louis I and the Greek War of Independence, 608; 611
Bazaine, 295; commander at Metz, 296
Beaconsfield, Lord. *See* Disraeli
Beauharnais, Eugène, 51
Beauharnais, Hortense (daughter of the Empress Josephine), 127
Bebel, Socialist leader, 313
Belfast, 484; university at, for Protestants, 516
Belfort, 295
Belgium, annexed to Holland, 3, 5; rise of the Kingdom of, 101-106; difficulties concerning the constitution, 102-103; influence of the July Revolution in *(1830)*, 103-104; the Belgians declare their independence, 104; Leopold of Coburg elected King of, 104; recognition of the Kingdom of, 105; and Congo Free State, 554-557, 583; reign of Leopold I of *(1831-1865)*, 581-582; reign of Leopold II *(1865-1909)*, 582; extension of the suffrage *(1893)*, 582; establishes trade centers at the five treaty ports of China, 686
Belgrade, capital of Servia, 604
Bell, Alexander Graham, invents the telephone *(1876)*, 726
Benedek, Austrian commander *(1866)*, 264
Benedetti, French ambassador to Prussia, interview with the King of Prussia at Ems, 291-292
Bengal, 519, 520
Bentham, Jeremy, 417
Beresford, Lord, in Portugal, 575
Berlin, news of the Revolution of *1848* in Paris reaches, 152; revolutionary movement of March, *1848*, in, 173; police regulation of *1851* in, 241; becomes the capital of united Germany, 302; representation in the Reichstag, 325, 327; representation in the Prussian Parliament, 326; Congress of *1884-1885*, 555; Berlin Act, *1885*, 555-556; Memorandum, *1876*, 620; Congress of, *1878*, 320, 405, 625-626
Berlin Act of *1885*, 555; Leopold II and, 556
Berlin Conference, *1884-1885*, concerning Congo Free State, 555
Berlin Congress of *1878*, 320, 405, 625-626; the Powers do not prevent the breaches in the Berlin Treaty, 629, 640, 644
Berlin Memorandum, *1876*, 620
Bern, 584; chosen capital of Switzerland, *1848*, 587
Bernadotte, Crown Prince of Sweden, 2; sent into Norway, 595. *See* Charles XIV

Bernhardi, 243
Berry, Duchess of, 94, 122-123
Berry, Duke of, Murder of, 79; birth of posthumous son, 82, 97
Bessarabia, retained by Russia at Congress of Vienna, 8; part of, ceded to Moldavia by Treaty of Paris *(1856)*, 615; Russia recovers a part of, 616; ceded to Russia by Treaty of San Stefano, *1878*, 625; cession of, reaffirmed by Congress of Berlin, *1878*, 626
Bethmann-Hollweg, German Chancellor, July, *1909*——, 323
Biarritz, Interview at *(1865)*, 260
Birrell Act, *1908*, 516
Bismarck, Otto von, 224, 242, 243; and German Unity, 240-271; appointed President of the Ministry, *1862*, 250; previous career, 251; political opinions of, 251; attitude toward parliamentary institutions, 252; hatred of democracy, 253; in the Diet, 254; attitude toward Austria, 253 and 254; carries through the army reform, 255; policy of "blood and iron," 255; diplomacy concerning Schleswig-Holstein, 257; and the Convention of Gastein, 259-260; conference with Napoleon III at Biarritz *(1865)*, 260; 286; treaty of alliance with Italy, 261; proposes a reform of the confederation, 262; orders Prussian troops to enter Holstein, 263; at Königgrätz, 265; and the Prussian Parliament, 268; author of the constitution of the North German Confederation, 268-270; forms alliance with South German States, 270; the consolidation of the new system, 270; attitude toward Napoleon III's projects for the acquisition of territory, *1866-1867*, 288; and the candidacy of Prince Leopold, 290-292; the Ems despatch, 292; diplomacy of, completely isolates France, 294; arranges terms of peace with Thiers at Versailles, 300; German unification completed, 301; becomes Chancellor, 305; and the Kulturkampf, 306-310; and the Falk Laws, 308; and the policy of protection, 310-312; and Socialism, 312-318; policy of State Socialism and measures carried, 316; his contribution to the solution of the social question, 317; Socialists fail to coöperate with, 317; and the acquisition of colonies, 318-319; and the Triple Alliance, 319-320; and the Austro-German treaty of *1879*, 321; resigns *(1890)*, 323; death of *(1898)*, 323; 594; President of the Congress of Berlin, *1878*, 625
Black Sea, neutralized by Treaty of Paris *(1856)*, 615; Russia disregards neutrality of, 616
Blanc, Louis, Theories of, 138, 189; 143; in the Provisional Government, 188; conception of the Republic, 188; appointed head of the Labor Commission, 191-192
"*Bloc*," The, 364
Bloemfontein, 538; convention of, 538; conferences at, *1899*, 543
Blücher, on the Congress of Vienna, 11
Board Schools (England), established, 479; boards abolished, 514
Boer War, *1899-1902*, 512. *See* British South Africa
Boers, migration of, into Natal, 537; and the founding of the Transvaal, 538; at Majuba Hill, 539; and the Pretoria Convention, *1881*, 540; and the London Convention, *1884*, 540; desire unqualified independence, 540; and the Uitlanders, 541; Sir Alfred Milner on, 542; and the South African War, 543
Bohemia, a part of the Austrian Empire, 23; condition of the peasants in, 26; development of nationality in, Czech movement, 153; revolution in, 171, 388; invasion of, by Prussia *(1866)*, 265; position in the Empire *(1861)*, 390; demands of the Czechs *(1868)*, 397; concessions to Czechs in, 400; division among Czechs in, 401
Bokhara, 682
Bologna, insurrection in, *1831*, 110
Bombay, English possession, 519
Bonapartists (France), 127, 344
Bordeaux, Napoleon III's speech at, 213; seat of government dur-

Bordeaux, *continued*
ing a part of the siege of Paris, 298; French National Assembly meets at *(1871)*, 300, 329; Treaty of Frankfort ratified by Assembly at, 301
Bordeaux, Duke of, 97, 98, 117, 122. *See also* Count of Chambord
Borneo, 581
Borny, Germans defeat French at, 296
Bosnia, occupied by Austria, 320; Slavs of, aid Herzegovina *(1875)*, 620; annexed by Austria-Hungary *(1908)*, 404, 639-640
Botany Bay, 531
Botha, Louis, in the South African War, 543
Boulanger, General, Minister of War *(1886)*, ambition of, 356; trial and flight of, 357
Boulogne, Louis Napoleon at, 129, 199
Bourbon, now called Réunion, Island of, owned by France, *1815*, 371
Bourbons, Restoration of, 2, 66-99, 119; Bourbon line in Spain, 565, 569
Bourgeois, Émile, address at the First Peace Conference at the Hague *(1899)*, 731
Bourmont, Minister of War, 90
"Boxer" movement, *1900*, 698
Brandenburg, 251
Brazil, flight of the royal family of Portugal to, *1807*, 575; Dom Pedro regent of, 576; declared an independent empire under Dom Pedro I, *1822*, 576; recognized by Portugal, *1825*, 576
Bremen, member of North German Confederation, 268; member of German Empire, 304; merchants from, establish trading stations, 318
Briand, Minister of Public Worship, and the enforcement of the Law of *1905*, 370
Bright, John, and the Anti-Corn-Law League, 452; on the Irish Famine *(1845)*, 453; and the Reform Bill of *1867*, 463; in the Gladstone Ministry, *1868*, 465; the Bright clauses in the Irish
Bright, John, *continued*
Land Act of *1870*, 475; on the Forster Education Act of *1870*, 481; attitude toward Irish University Bill of *1873*, 485; opposition to the Irish Home Rule and Land Bills, 503; becomes a Liberal Unionist, 504
Brisson Ministry, and the Dreyfus case, 360-363
British Columbia, responsible government granted to, *1871*, 527; admitted into the Dominion of Canada, *1871*, 529
British Empire. *See* England
British Empire in the Nineteenth Century, The, 518-549
British North America, 523-530; Act *(1867)*, 528
British South Africa, 536-545; England acquires Cape Colony, 536; friction with the Boers, 537; the Great Trek, *1836*—, 537; founding of the Transvaal, 538; Transvaal annexed to Great Britain, *1877*, 538; Majuba Hill, 539; Pretoria Convention, *1881*, 540; London Convention, *1884*, 540; discovery of gold in the Transvaal, *1884*, 541; Jameson Raid, *1895*, 541; Sir Alfred Milner's Reports on, *1899*, 542; South African War, *1899-1902*, 543-544; annexation of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State to the British Empire, *1902*, 544; Union of South Africa, *1909*, 544-545; autonomy in, 546; and the problem of imperial federation, 547
Broglie, Achille Charles, Duke of, 87, 120, 130
Broglie, Jacques Victor, ministry of, 349
Brougham, Lord Chancellor, 436
Brunswick, revolutionary movements in *(1830)*, 112; 147; in the North German Confederation, 269
Brussels, 102; riot in *(1830)*, 104; seat of the International African Association, 554
Bryce, James, on the advantages of federation to the Australians, 533; *American Commonwealth*, censorship of, in Russia, 678

Bucharest, capital of Roumania, 618; Treaty of, *1886*, 629
Budapest, 171, 177, 394, 395
Bukharest. *See* Bucharest
Bulgaria, Slavs of, aid Herzegovina, *1875*, 620; atrocities in, *1876*, 621; siege of Plevna, 623; by Treaty of San Stefano, *1878*, made a self-governing state tributary to the Sultan, 624; territory of, 624; disposition of, by Congress of Berlin, *1878*, 625; since *1878*, 626-631; Alexander of Battenberg chosen Prince of, *1879*, 628; friction between the Bulgarians and the Russians, 628; Union of the two Bulgarias, *1885*, 626, 629; Servia declares war upon, 629; expels the Servians, 629; Treaty of Bucharest, *1886*, 629; abdication of Prince Alexander, 630; election of Ferdinand of Saxe-Coburg *(1887)*, 630; dictatorship of Stambuloff, 630; election of Ferdinand recognized by the Powers, 631; declares her independence, October 5, *1908*, 631, 639, 644; attitude toward Turkey, *1908*, 641; and armed peace, 732
"*Bulgarian Horrors and the Question of the East*," by Gladstone, 622
Bulgars, The, 603 (note)
Buliguin, 710
Bülow, von, German Chancellor, *1900-1909*, 323
Bundesrath, 269, 303-304
Bunsen, 242
Burke, Thomas, assassinated *(1882)*, 499
Burma, annexed by England, 523; English control of, 681
Burschenschaft, The, 39-42
Bute, 412
Butt, first leader of the Irish Home Rulers, 498
Buxton, and the anti-slavery agitation, 440
Byron, Lord, and the Greek War of Independence, 608

"*Cadets*," Constitutional Democratic Party in Russia, 713
Cadiz, 48; meeting of Cortes at, 63; siege of, 63
Cairo, 559
Cambodia, Kingdom of, France establishes protectorate over, 373
Cambridge, local government in *(1832)*, 443; University of, 415, 485
Cameron, African explorer, 553
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir Henry, leader of the Liberal Party, *1905-1908*, 515
Canada, an English possession *(1815)*, 519; constitutional difficulty in Upper and Lower, 523-525; rebellion of *1837* in, 446, 525; the Durham Mission and Report on, 525-527; fusion of Upper and Lower *(1840)*, 527; introduction of ministerial responsibility in *(1847)*, 527; founding of Dominion of *(1867)*, 528; Parliament of the Dominion of, 529; growth of the Dominion of, 529; Dominion of, purchases Hudson Bay Territory *(1869)*, 529; Alberta and Saskatchewan admitted into the Dominion *(1905)*, 529; relation of, to England, 529; Canadian Pacific Railway, 530; and the South African war *(1899)*, 544; autonomy in, 546; and the problem of federation, 547; preferential tariffs, 548
Canary Islands, relation of, to Spain, 574
Canning, 64-65; Foreign Secretary *(1822)*, 422; detaches England from Holy Alliance, 423; recognizes independence of the Spanish colonies in America, 423; and Catholic Emancipation, 426; and the Greek War of Independence, 608, 610
Canovas, leader of the Conservatives in Spain, *1876*, 573
Canton, 684, 685, 686
Cape Colony, retained by England, *1815*, 9, 536, 551; responsible government granted to, *1872*, 528; the Great Trek, 537; 542; and the South African War, *1899*, 544
Cape of Good Hope, 488; acquired by England, 519; position in the South African Union, *1909*, 544-545
Cape Town, 545
Caprivi, German Chancellor, *1890-1894*, 323

Capua, 236; Francis II defeated at, 237
Carbonari, in France, 91, 95; in Italy, 56, 110, 159, 161, *222*
Carlists, Wars of the, 566-568, *572*
Carlos, Don, claim to the throne of Spain, 565; Carlist war, *566*
Carlos I of Portugal, *1889-1908*, *577*; assassinated, *1908*, *577*
Carlotta, wife of Maximilian, Archduke of Austria, *279*
Carlsbad Decrees, 41-44, 112
Carlstad, Treaty of, *1905*, 599-600
Carlyle, on Queen Victoria's accession, 445; on Chartism, 450; on the Reform Bill of *1867*, 464; on the *Great Western*, *724*
"*Carmen Sylva*," Queen Elizabeth of Roumania, 619
Carnot, becomes President of the French Republic *(1887)*, 355; assassinated *(1894)*, 358
Caroline Islands, purchased by Germany from Spain *(1899)*, 319
Carrara, *223*
Cartwright, 407, *722*
Casimir-Périer, on the Press in France, 88; and the conservatives, 120-122, 130; grandson of, elected President of French Republic *(1894)*, 358; resigns, 358
Cassel, *264*
Castelar, on the establishment of a republic in Spain, 571; *572*
Castelfidardo, battle of, *236*
Castille, 565; Carlists in, *567*
Castlereagh, 15
Catherine II of Russia, 601
Catholic Church (Roman) and the government of Rome after *1815*, *55*; the religion of the state in France *(1814)*, 69; French expedition to Rome *(1849)*, 182; abolition of the temporal power of the Pope of, 301; struggle with the German Empire, 305; and the Kulturkampf, 306-310; dogma of Papal Infallibility in, 307; the Old Catholics, 307; and the Falk Laws, 308-309; and the Third Republic, 349; question of, and State in France, 365; Law of Associations *(1901)* in France, 366; religious orders forbidden to engage in teaching in France, 366; and the Concordat of *1801*, 367; anticlerical legislation in France, *1881-1903*, 367;
Catholic Church (Roman), *continued*
attitude of the clergy of, in the Dreyfus affair, 368; Pius X protests against the visit of President Loubet of France to Victor Emmanuel III, 368; and the abrogation of the Concordat, 368; and the Associations of Worship in France *(1905)*, 369; Pius X and the Associations, 369; French Law of January *2*, *1907*, 370; separation of, and State in France, 370; relation of, and State in Italy, 378; Law of Papal Guarantees, 378; the Curia Romana, 379; powers of, restricted in Austria, 396-397; in Spain, 575; in Belgium, 583
Catholic Emancipation (England), *1829*, 428
Cavaignac, Jacques Marie Eugène, son of Louis Eugène Cavaignac, Minister of War, 360; speech of, concerning the Dreyfus case, 361
Cavaignac, General Louis Eugène, 99; Dictatorship of, during the June Days, 194; candidate for the presidency of the republic, 199
Cavendish, Lord Frederick, assassinated, 499
Cavite, battle of, 574
Cavour, Count Camillo di, and the Creation of the Kingdom of Italy, 215-239; and Napoleon III, 215-227; early life, 216; his interest in political and economic questions, 217; becomes an editor, 217; prime minister *(1852)*, 217; policy of economic development, 218; Crimean policy, 219; at the Congress of Paris, 220; and army reform, 221; interview at Plombières with Napoleon III, *222*; Austro-Sardinian War, *225*; displeasure at the terms of Villafranca and resignation, *227*; returns to office, 230; bargain with Napoleon III concerning Savoy and Nice, 230-232; policy concerning Garibaldi's expedition, 234-237; and the question of Rome and the Kingdom of Italy, 238; death of, 239; characterization of, 239; on problems confronting the new kingdom, 376,

Cavour, Count Camillo di, *continued*
377; attitude toward the Roman Catholic Church, 378; 387
Cawnpore, 521
Central Europe, between two Revolutions, 145-168; in Revolt, 169-186
Certain Features of Modern Progress, 719-736
Ceylon, English possession *(1815)*, 9, 519; 559
Châlons, MacMahon retreats to, 296
Chamberlain, Joseph, becomes a Liberal-Unionist, 504; and the Second Home Rule Bill, 509; in the Colonial Office, 511; and imperialism, 511; and preferential duties, 548; and the Colonial conferences, 548
Chambord, Count of (Duke of Bordeaux), grandson of Charles X, 97; and the Legitimists, 341, 342
Charles Albert, Prince of Carignan, 61; King of Piedmont, 164, 166; reforms of, 167; defeated at Custozza, 176; abdication of, 181; death of, 182; grants Constitutional Statute *(1848)*, 185, 215
Charles Felix, 61-62
Charles I of Roumania, *1866*—; reign of, 619-620, 632
Charles IV of Spain, 565
Charles X, King of France *(1824-1830)*, reign of, 83-97; policy of, 83-89; defeat of Villèle's ministry, 89; Martignac ministry, 89; Polignac ministry, 90-91; conflict with the Chamber of Deputies, 91; dissolves the Chamber, 91; Ordinances of July *(1830)*, 92; his interpretation of the Charter, 93; and the July Revolution, 95; abdicates, 97; retires to England, 97; death of *(1836)*, 98. *See also* Artois, Count of
Charles XIII, King of Norway and Sweden, adopts Bernadotte, as Crown Prince, 596; 598
Charles XIV, *1818-1844*, King of Norway and Sweden, reign of, 596-597. *See* Bernadotte
Charles XV, King of Norway and Sweden, *1859*-1872, Constitution of *1866*, 597
Chartist Movement, 446-450
Châteaubriand, 88; and the Greek War of Independence, 608
Child Labor (England), 440-442; Factory Act *(1833)* regulating, 442; Labor in Mines Act, 455-456; Factory Act *(1844)*, 456; Factory and Workshop Consolidation Act of *1878*, 456-457; Factory and Workshop Act of *1901*, 457; 506
China, 518; Russia acquires the northern bank of the Amur *(1858)* and the Maritime Province *(1860)* from, 682; civilization of, 683; government of, 684; isolation of, 684; Opium War, *1840-1842*, 685; signs Treaty of Nanking *(1842)* opening four ports to British trade, 685; entrance of various powers into commercial relations with, 686; France joins England in war against, 686; Treaties of Tientsin *(1858)*, 686; confirmed *(1860)*, 687; Japan's war with *(1894)*, 695; signs Treaty of Shimonoseki *(1895)*, 696; intervention of Russia, France, and Germany in, 696; Russia secures rights in Manchuria from, 697; Germany establishes a "sphere of influence" in *(1898)*, 697; the "*Boxer*" movement in *(1900)*, 698; influence of the Russo-Japanese War upon, 703; reform in, 704; promise of constitution to, 705
Chino-Japanese War, *1894*, 695-696
Chios, Turkish massacre in, 607
Christian Frederick, elected King of Norway, May 17, *1814*, abdicates October 7, *1814*, 596
Christian VIII, King of Denmark, *1839-1848*, 593
Christian IX, King of Denmark, *1863-1906*, succeeds Frederick VII, 257; and Schleswig-Holstein, 593; war with Prussia and Austria and Treaty of Vienna *(1864)*, 259, 593; revision of Constitution of *1849 (1866)*, 594
Christiania, capital of Norway, 596
Christina, wife of Ferdinand VII of Spain, Regent of Spain, *1833-1840*, 566; grants the Royal Statute, *1834*, 567; promulgates the Constitution of *1837*, 568; driven into exile, 568

Church of England, position of, in England *(1815)*, 415; abuses within, 416; religious disabilities of Dissenters from, 424; position of, in Ireland, 468; schools of, 477; tests of, in universities (England) abolished, 483; voluntary schools connected with, 513-514. *See* Irish Church
Churchill, Lord Randolph, and the Second Home Rule Bill, 509
Cisleithania, 395. *See* Austria
Civil Service reform in England, 482; of India, 522
Civil War (United States), England and, 461, 486
Clare, County of, O'Connell elected to Parliament from, 427
Clarendon, Lord, on the Italian question, 220; in the Gladstone ministry of *1868*, 465
Clausewitz, on German unity, 34
Clemenceau, leader of the Radicals, 354
Clericalism, 349
Clotilde, Princess, betrothed to Prince Jerome Napoleon, 223
Coalition, The Great, 1, 592; treaties of, 2
Cobbett, William, and *"The Weekly Political Register,"* 419; driven into exile, 421
Cobden, Richard, and the Anti-Corn-Law League, 452
Coburg, Leopold of, elected King of Belgium, 104
Cochin-China, acquired by France *(1858-1867)*, 373
Collectivism, Growth of, 458. *See* Socialism
Colonial Conferences (British), *1887*, *1897*, *1902*, *1907*, 548
Colonies, of Belgium, Congo Free State *(1908)*, 557; of Denmark, in Africa *(1815)*, 551; *(1909)*, 594-595; of France *(1815)*, 371, 551; acquisitions in the nineteenth century, 353-354, 371-375, 554; in Asia, 681; of Germany, in Africa, 319, 554; of Great Britain *(1815)*, 3, 9, 519, 551; slavery abolished in *(1834)*, 440; the Disraeli Ministry and, 487; India, 519-523; British North America, 523-530; Australia, 530-534; New Zealand, 534-536; British South Africa, 536-545; other African possessions, 552-554, 562; Egypt, 554, 561; in Asia, 681; of Holland *(1815)*, 551; *(1909)* 581; of Italy, 382-383, 554; of Portugal *(1815)*, 551; acquisitions in Africa *(1884-1890)*, 554; possessions of, 578; of Spain *(1815)*, 551; loses American *(1898)*, 565, 574; possessions of *(1898)*, 574
Combes, Prime Minister (France), attitude toward clericalism, 366
Commonwealth of Australia. *See* Australia
Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act, The *(1900)*, 533
Commune of Paris, The *(1871)* conditions in Paris prior to, 330-333; government of, 333; and the National Assembly, 334-335; cost of insurrection to France, 337
Concert of Powers, at Congress of Vienna, 16; signs Quadruple Alliance, 17; Turkey admitted to, 616
Concordat of *1801*, 367; abrogated *(1905)*, 368
Confederation of the Rhine, a Napoleonic creation, 29
Congo Free State, founded by Leopold II of Belgium, 554; relation of, to Leopold II, 555-557; conditions in, *1905*, 557; declared a colony by Belgium, *1908*, 557; Congo, International Association of the, 555
Congo River, 552; Stanley's explorations of, 553
Congress of Berlin *(1878)*, 625-627; and the Greek frontier, 635; breaches of the Treaty of Berlin, 629, 640, 644
Congress of Paris *(1856)*, 212, 220, 615-616
Congress of Vienna (September, *1814*-June, *1815)* Membership of, 3-5; demands of Russia and Prussia at, 6-7; Secret Treaty of Defensive Triple Alliance concluded at, 7; division of the spoils by, 7-10; criticism of, 10; and the German Confederation, 29, 32, 35, 38; Final Act of, 4, 12; and Italy, 52, 230; and the Kingdom of the Netherlands, 101; and Belgium, 105; and Poland, 106; and the Pact of *1815*

Congress of Vienna, *continued* (Switzerland), 584; and Greece, 605; Alexander I at, 647, 649; compared with the Hague Peace Conference, 736
Congresses, The (*see also* Congress of Vienna), Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle *(1818)*, 59, 649; Congress of Troppau *(1820)*, 59; Congress of Laibach *(1821)*, 60; Congress of Verona *(1822)*, 62-63
Constantine, brother of Alexander I of Russia, driven from Warsaw, 108; renounces crown, 650
Constantinople, 131, 557; in War of Greek Independence, 606; events in *(1876)*, 620; Russians march toward, 611, 624; counter-revolution of April, *1909*, in, 642
Constitution, of *1791* (French), 46, 576; of *1812* (Spanish), 45-46, abolished, 47; of *1815* (Switzerland), 584; of *1837* (Spanish), 568; of *1848* (Holland), 580; of *1848* (Switzerland), 586; of *1850* (Prussia), 185-186; of *1866* (Norway and Sweden), 597; of *1875* (France), 345, revision of *(1884)*, 353; of *1876* (Spanish), 573
Constitutional Charter, *1814* (France), 67-70; change in, 82; Charles X's interpretation of, 93; revised, 116
Constitutional Statute *(1848)*, Piedmont, Charles Albert grants, 185
Convention of Bloemfontein, 538
Corfe Castle, 413
Cork, College at, 484, 516
Corn Laws (England), 449; of *1815* and *1828*, 451; repeal of, *1846*, 454, 469
Cornwall, County of, representation in House of Commons, *1815*, 411
Corporation Act, Repeal of, *1828*, 425
Cortes (Portuguese), 576
Cortes (Spanish), Position of, under the Constitution of *1812*, 46; retire to Cadiz on the invasion of the French *(1823)*, 63; and the Constitution of *1837*, 568; promulgate the Constitution of *1869*, 569-570; proclaim the Republic *(1873)*, 571
Council of the Empire, The (Russia), constituted by the Tsar, 713
County Councils Act of *1888*, 506
Courland, 645
Cousin, 86
Couza, Colonel Alexander, elected Prince by Moldavia and Wallachia *(1859)*, 618; abdication of, 619
Cowper-Temple Amendment to Forster Education Act of *1870*, 480
Cracow, erected into a free city, 8; Republic of, 106
Crete, Island of, 612; disposition of *1897*, 635 and note; Oct. 7, *1908*, declares for union with Greece, 639
Crimea, War in, 611-617; reasons for Piedmont's participation in, 219; England and, 458; invasion of the, 614; siege of Sebastopol, 614; battles of the Alma, Balaklava, and Inkermann, 614; Treaty of Paris *(1856)*, 615; results of the war, 616; Russia in, 654
Crispi, Francesco, Prime Minister, *1887-1891*, *1893-1896*, colonial policy, 382; policy of repression, 383
Croatia, Kingdom of, 24; a certain measure of autonomy in, 155; Jellachich appointed governor of, 177; severed from Hungary, 388; position in the Empire *(1861)*, 390; a province of Hungary, 396
Croker, on Second Reform Bill, 435
Cromarty, 412
Cromer, Lord, and Egypt, 560-561
Crompton, 407, 722
Cuba, Spanish possession, 565; insurrections in, *1868-1878*, *1895*, 572, 574; Spanish-American War in *(1898)*, 574; Spain loses, 574
Cumberland, Duke of, accession of, to throne of Hanover, 446
Cunard, Samuel, founder of first transatlantic steamship line, 724
Curaçao, 581
Curia Romana, 379
Curtius, 246
Cushing, Caleb, sent by the United States to make a commercial treaty with China, *1844*, 686

Custozza, battle of *(1848)* between Austrians and Sardinians, 176, 181, 215; second battle of, *(1866)* between Austrians and Italians, 265
Cyprus, 639, 643
Czechs, in Bohemia, 153, 172, 175; demands of *(1868)*, 397; concessions to, under the Taaffe ministry, 400; division among, 401

Dahomey, French possession, 374
Daimios, The, of Japan, 689; and the policy of isolation, 690-691, 692; relinquish their feudal rights, 693
Danube, navigation of, declared free by Treaty of Paris *(1856)*, 615
Danubian Principalities, Moldavia and Wallachia, become practically independent, 611; Russian influence in, 611; Russian troops enter, *1853*, 612; Russian evacuation of, *1854*, 614; declared under the suzerainty of the Porte by the Treaty of Paris *(1856)*, 615; the Roumanians in, and the Crimean War, 617; elect Colonel Alexander Couza as their prince, 618; union of the Principalities, 618. *See* Roumania
Dawson, estimate of Bismarck's policy of State Socialism, 317
Days of March, Hungary *(1848)*, 170, 174
Days of June, France *(1848)*, 194, 198
D'Azeglio, *1798-1866*, Author of "*Recent Events in Romagna*," 165; and the question of Rome and the Kingdom of Italy, 238; on Italian unity, 376
Deák, Francis, 158; leader of the moderate liberals in Hungary *(1861)*, 391
Decazes, Minister of Louis XVIII, 75; and the Electoral Law, 77; forced to resign, 80
Delarey, in the South African War, 543
Delhi, 521.
Demerara, retained by England *(1815)*, 9.
Denmark, King of, at Congress of Vienna, 4; loses Norway, 11, 592; King of, a member of the German Confederation, 31; influence of events in Italy *(1859)* upon, 246; war with Prussia and Austria and Treaty of Vienna, *(1864)* 256-259, 593; possessions of, in Africa *(1815)*, 551; government of, 592-593; Frederick VII grants constitutions to, 593; revision of the Constitution of *1849 (1866)*, 594; growth of radicalism in, 594; colonies of, 594-595; Prince Charles of, becomes Haakon VII of Norway *(1905)*, 600
Depretis, colonial policy of, 382
Derby, Lord, attitude of the Derby-Disraeli ministry toward the Jews, 458; becomes Prime Minister, 462; on the Reform Bill of *1867*, 464
Deshima, Peninsula of, 690
Devil's Island, Dreyfus deported to, 359; Dreyfus brought from, 362
Devonshire, Duke of. *See* Hartington, Lord
Dicey, A. V., on the Factory and Workshop Act of *1901*, 457
Diet of Frankfort, 29; forced vote on Carlsbad Decrees, 41; new measures of repression *(1832)*, 112; and the national movement in Germany, 174; revived *(1851)*, 185, 240; Bismarck, Prussian delegate to *(1851)*, 253; King of Denmark as Duke of Holstein represented in, 257; protests against the incorporation of Schleswig with Denmark, 257; Austria brings Schleswig-Holstein question before the, 263; Austria moves in the, that the federal forces be sent against Prussia, 263; ceases to exist, 268
Disraeli, 461; becomes leader of the House of Commons, *1866*, 462; Reform Bill of *1867* carried by, 463; on the Irish Land Act of *1870*, 476; attitude toward Irish University Bill of *1873*, 485; ministry of, *1874-1880*, 486-490; and imperialism, 487; and the purchase of the Suez Canal shares, 488; proposes title of Empress of India for the Queen, 489; foreign policy of, 489; becomes

Disraeli, *continued*
Lord Beaconsfield *(1876)*, 489; fall of ministry of, 490, 539; death of *(1881)*, 497; and the annexation of the Transvaal to Great Britain, 538; and the Bulgarian atrocities, 622; represents England at the Congress of Berlin *(1878)*, 625.
Divorce, in France, abolished in *1814*, restored in *1884*, 352
Dobrudscha, ceded to Roumania in place of Bessarabia, 625-626
Döllinger, on the Dogma of Papal Infallibility, 307
Dominion of Canada. *See* Canada
Dominion of New Zealand. *See* New Zealand
Dostoievski, 652
Double Vote, in France, by Electoral Law of *1820*, 81; rescinded *(1831)*, 117
Draga, Queen, wife of Alexander I of Servia, murder of, 633
Dresden, retained by King of Saxony, 8; Prussian troops occupy, 264
Dreyfus Case, 358-364; Dreyfus (Alfred) condemned for treason *(1895)*, 359; attempts in Dreyfus' favor, 360; Zola tries to reopen the, 360; Court of Cassation orders a retrial of, *1899*, 362; Dreyfus pardoned by President Loubet, 362; vindicated, 363; the clergy in, 368
Droysen, 246
Dual Alliance *(1891)*, Russia and France, 357
Dual Control *(1879-1883)*, England and France in Egypt, 559, 561
Dual Monarchy (Austria-Hungary), 393-396
Dublin, Irish Parliament at, abolished *(1800)*, 468; Universities at, 484; formation of Home Rule League at, 497; Thomas Burke assassinated at, 499; University at *(1908)*, for Catholics, 516
Duchies, War of the. *See* Schleswig-Holstein
Duma, Character of the, 711, 712; elections to, 713; Nicholas II opens the, May 10, *1906*, 713; demands and impotence of, 714; dissolved by the Tsar, July *22*, *1906*, 715; Viborg Manifesto by members of the, 715; The Second, opened by the Tsar, March *5*, *1907*, 715, dissolved, June 16, *1907*, 716; The Third, November 14, *1907*, 716
Dunwich, 413
Durham, Lord, in the Grey Ministry, 430; on condition of the colonies in Canada, 525; mission of, 525; report of, 525-527, 528
Dutch Guiana, 581

East India Company, 519, 522
East Indies, 519; Dutch colonies in, 581
East Prussia, 326
Eastern Question, Thiers and, 131; Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi *(1833)*, 132; London Conference *(1840)* and, 132; Austria-Hungary and, 405; importance of, 602; Nicholas I and, 611-612; Moldavia-Wallachia and, 611, 617; reopening of, *1875*, 489, 620; England and, 625; Congress of Berlin *(1878)* and, 625-627; Young Turks and, 636-644. *See also* Turkey and Chapter XXVIII, 601-644, *passim*
Edict of Emancipation (Russia), *1861*, 657
Edinburgh, 98
Edinburgh Review (1819), Francis Jeffrey on the steam engine, 408
Education, Creation of a national system of, in France, 352; compulsory, in Italy by Education Laws, *1877* and *1904*, 381; secular, established in Austria, 397; in England by Forster Education Act of *1870*, 478-481; attendance made compulsory in England *(1880)*, 481; made free in England *(1891)*, 481; Education Act of *1902*, 513-514; in Portugal, 578; in Belgium, 582-583; in Denmark, 594; in Greece, 635; in Russia, 660, 661; in Japan, 693; in China, 704
Edward VII, *1901*—, accession of, 513
Egypt, war with Turkey, 131; Khedive of, sells shares of

Egypt, *continued*
Suez Canal to England, 488; early history of, 550; in *1815*, 551; English occupation of, *1882*, 554; 557-563; relation to Turkey, 557; Mehemet Ali in, 557; intervention of England and France in, 559; revolt of Arabi Pasha, 559; English expedition crushes the revolt, 559; England assumes the position of adviser in, 560; English occupation of, 561; loss of the Soudan, 561; recovery of the Soudan, 562; part of the Ottoman Empire *(1815)*, 601; condition in *1815*, 602, 643
Eidsvold, Constitution of, *1814*, 595, 598
Elba, 122
Electricity, and the industrial development of Italy, 385-386; the telegraph, the telephone, 726
Elgin, Lord, Governor of Canada, introduces principle of ministerial responsibility, 527
Ely, attitude of government toward rioters in, 420
Emancipation of the serfs, in Russia *(1861)*, 657
Empress-Dowager of China, 698; change of policy of the, 704
Ems, 291; despatch, 292
Ena, Princess, of Battenberg, marries King Alfonso XIII of Spain *(1906)*, 575
England, retains Malta *(1815)*, 3; acquisitions of *(1815)*, 9; signs Quadruple Alliance *(1815)*, 17; King of, a member of the German Confederation for Hanover, 31; at Congress of Troppau *(1820)*, 59; opposes policy of armed intervention in Spain, 63; Canning restricts Holy Alliance to the Continent of Europe, 64-65; influence of July Revolution *(1830)* in, 100; favors election of Leopold of Coburg as King of Belgium, 104; recognizes Kingdom of Belgium at conference of the Powers in London *(1830-1831)*, 105; aids Turkey against Russia, 132; London Conference *(1840)*, 132; with France and Piedmont wages war against Russia in the Crimea, 212, 219;
England, *continued*
at Congress of Paris *(1856)*, 220; participates in affairs in Italy, 229; attitude toward the cession of Savoy and Nice to France, 231, 274; Napoleon III's treaty of commerce with *(1860)*, 274; intervenes with France and Spain in Mexico, 277; neutrality of, in Franco-German war, 294; Free Trade in, 310-312, 450-455; fleet of, bombards Algiers, 372; to the Reform Bill of *1832*, 406-438; in *1815*, 406; industrial revolution in, 406-408; renown of Parliament, 409; a land of the old régime, 409; commanding position of the nobility in, 410; House of Commons *(1815)*, 410-414; the Church of, 415-416; works of Adam Smith and Jeremy Bentham on conditions in, 417; effect of the French Revolution upon, 417; economic distress in, after *1815*, 418; Corn Law of *1815*, 418; demand for reform, 419; William Cobbett and parliamentary reform, 419-420; popular disturbances *(1816)*, 420; Spa Fields, 420; suspension of Habeas Corpus *(1817)*, 421; massacre of Peterloo *(1819)*, 421; Parliament passes the Gag Laws, 422; death of George III *(1820)*, and accesion of George IV *(1820-1830)*, 422; era of reform after *1820*, 422; defiance of the Holy Alliance, 422; economic reforms in, 423; Penal Code, reformed by Sir Robert Peel, 424; religious inequality, 424; repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts *(1828)*, 425; O'Connell founds the Catholic Association in Ireland, 427; O'Connell elected to Parliament, 427; Catholic Emancipation Act *(1829)*, 428; Tory opposition to the reform of Parliament, 428; death of George IV and accession of William IV, 428; influence of the French Revolution of *1830*, 429; fall of the Tory ministry, 430; First Reform Bill, 430; speeches for and against, 431-435; ministry defeated, Parlia-

England, *continued*
ment dissolved, 435; Second Reform Bill defeated by the House of Lords, 435; Third Reform Bill, 436; Grey Ministry resigns, 436; William IV attempts to get a ministry, fails and recalls Grey, 436; the Bill passed, June 4, *1832*, 437; redistribution of seats, 437; the franchise, 437; between two Great Reforms *(1832-1867)*, 439-464; era of Whig government, 439; abolition of slavery in the colonies, *1834*, 440; child labor agitation, 440-441; Factory Act, *1833*, 442; evils in local government, 442; Municipal Corporations Act, *1835*, 444; death of William IV and accession of Queen Victoria, 445; the Queen's political education and marriage, 445; loss of Hanover, 446; Chartist Movement, 446-450; The People's Charter (*1838*), 447; Lovett and O'Connor, 447-448; Petition of *1848*, 449; significance of the movement, 449; Free Trade and Anti-Corn-Law Agitation, 450-455; Anti-Corn-Law League *(1839)* Cobden, Bright and Villiers, 452; arguments for Free Trade, 452; Irish Famine, 453; repeal of the Corn Laws, *1846*, 454; remaining protective duties gradually removed, 454; Navigation Laws abolished *(1849)*, 454; labor legislation, *1840-1850*, 455-458; regulation of labor in mines, 455; Factory Laws of *1844*, *1847*, *1850*, Act of *1878*, 456; Morley on the labor code, 456; Factory and Workshop Act of *1901*, 457; growth of trades-unions, 457; growth of collectivism, 458; Jews admitted to House of Commons, *1858*, 458; abolition of property qualification for members of Parliament, 458; Gladstone, Chancellor of the Exchequer and his policy, 459; Postal Savings Banks, 459; industrial and scientific progress, 460; demand for a wider suffrage, 461; effect of the Civil War in the United States on, 461; Gladstone introduces a reform bill, *1866*, 461; Derby and Disraeli form a ministry, 462; Reform Bill of *1867* carried by Disraeli, 463; provisions of the Reform Bill of *1867*, 463; redistribution of seats, 464; the Liberals under Gladstone come into power, 464; under Gladstone and Disraeli, 465-496; the Great Ministry, 465; conditions in Ireland *(1815)*, 467-469; Disestablishment of the Irish Church, *1869*, 472; Irish Land Act of *1870*, 475-477; Church schools, 477; Forster Education Act of *1870*, 478-481; condition of education prior to *1870*, 478; inadequacy of the system, 478; the Act and its provisions, 478-480; attendance made compulsory *(1880)*, 481; attendance made free *(1891)*, 481; Education Act of *1902*, 481, 513-514; Army reform *(1871)*, 481-482; introduction of short service, 481; abolition of the purchase system, 482; Civil Service reform *(1870)*, 482; Ballot Law of *1872*, 483-484; Gladstone's Irish University Bill of *1873* defeated, 485; Gladstone resigns but returns to office, 485; the Alabama award, 486, 591; Conservatives under Disraeli come into office by elections of *1874*, 486; the Disraeli Ministry, *1874-1880*, 486-490; importance of the colonies emphasized, 487; purchase of the Suez Canal shares *(1875)*, 488, 558; Queen proclaimed Empress of India, 489, 522; reopening of the Eastern Question *(1876)*, 489; Second Gladstone Ministry, *1880-1885*, 490-496; failure of the Irish Land Act of *1870*, 490; Irish Land Act of *1881*, the Three F's, 491; Reform Bill of *1884*, 492; Redistribution Act of *1885*, 493; Single Member districts, 494; qualifications for voting, 495; since *1886*, 497-517; Irish Home Rule Movement, 498; Third Gladstone Ministry, *1886*, 499; introduction of the Home Rule Bill, 500; Irish Land Purchase Bill, 501; opposition to the bills,

England, *continued*
501-504; disruption of the Liberal Party, 504; Home Rule Bill defeated, 504; fall of Gladstone, 504; Second Salisbury Ministry, *1886-1892*, 505-507; policy of coercion for Ireland, 505; Land Purchase Act of *1891*, 505-506; County Councils Act of *1888*, 506; social legislation, 507; increase of the Navy, 507; Fourth Gladstone Ministry *(1892-1894)*, 507-510; second Home Rule Bill *(1893)*, 507-509; Parish Councils Bill of *1894*, 509; Gladstone resigns, 510; Rosebery Ministry, 510-511; Third Salisbury Ministry, 511-515; War in South Africa, *1899-1902*, 512; Irish Land Purchase Act of *1896*, 512; Irish Local Government Act *(1898)*, 512; Education Act of *1902*, 513; abolition of the school boards, 514; decline of illiteracy, 514; the Liberal Party in power, *1905—*, 515; Old Age Pensions Law *(1908)*, 515; Irish University or Birrell Act *(1908)*, 516; colonial possessions prior to *1815*, 519; India, 519-523; annexation of Burma and Baluchistan and protectorate of Afghanistan, 523; British North America, 523-530; the Durham Mission, 525; Lord Durham's Report, 525-527; the Oregon dispute, 529; relation of Canada to, 529; and Australia, 530-534; and New Zealand, 534-536; and British South Africa, 536-545; acquires Cape Colony, 536; friction with the Boers, 537; the Great Trek *(1836)*, 537; sends troops into Natal *(1842)*, 538; proclaims Natal a colony *(1843)*, 538; Orange Free State declared a part of the British Empire *(1848)*, 538; Transvaal annexed to the British Empire *(1877)*, 538; Majuba Hill, 539; Pretoria Convention, *1881*, 540; London Convention, *1884*, 540; Jameson Raid, *1895*, 541; Sir Alfred Milner's Reports, *1899*, 542; South African War, *1899-1902*, 543-544; annexation of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State to the British Empire, *1902*, 544; and Imperial Federation, 545-549; possessions in Africa, *1815*, 551; explorations in Africa, *552-553*; occupies Egypt, *1882*, 554; acquisitions in Africa, *1884-1890*, 554; at the Conference of the Powers, *1876*, 554; at the Congress of Berlin, *1884-1885*, 555; demands reforms in the Congo, 557; intervenes in Egypt, 559; crushes the revolt of Arabi Pasha, *1882*, 559; assumes the position of "adviser," 560; "occupation" of Egypt, 561; recovers Soudan, *1898*, 562; Lord Beresford in Portugal, *1807*, 575; intervenes in the Greek War of Independence, 608; and the Treaty of London, *1827*, 609; battle of Navarino, *1827*, 610; guarantees independence of Greece, 611; Nicholas I of Russia and, 611; in the Coalition against Russia, 613; invasion of the Crimea and siege of Sebastopol, 614; Treaty of Paris, *1856*, 615; and the Berlin Memorandum, *1876*, 620; demands revision of the Treaty of San Stefano, 625; at Congress of Berlin, *1878*, 625-626; occupies Cyprus, 626; cedes the Ionian Islands to Greece, *1864*, 634; induces the Sultan to cede Thessaly to Greece, *1881*, 634; attitude toward the breaches of the Berlin Treaty of *1878*, 629, 640; in Asia, 681; and the Opium War, *1840-1842*, 685; gains by Treaty of Nanking *(1842)*, 685; joined by France in second war against China, 686; Treaty of Tientsin *(1858)*, 686, confirmed, 687; bombards Kagoshima, 691; acquires a port in China by lease, 697; helps to rescue the legations in Peking, 698; diplomatic relations of, with Russia concerning Manchuria, 700; Anglo-Japanese Treaty of *1902*, 700
Epirus, 626
Eritrea, Italian colony, 382
Esterhazy, Major, and the Dreyfus Case, 359-363
Esthonia, 645

Eton College, Gladstone at, 465; 477
Eugénie, Empress, marries Napoleon III, 210; urges war against Prussia, 293; flees from Paris after the surrender of Napoleon III at Sedan, 297; 306
Europe, Reconstruction of, 1-22; Central, between two Revolutions, 145-168; Central, in Revolt, 169-186
"*Expansion of England*," by Seeley, on the government of India, 522

Factory Acts (England), Act of *1833*, 442; Acts of *1844*, *1847*, *1850*, 456; Act of *1878*, 456; Act of *1889*, 506-507; Factory and Workshop Act of *1901*, 457
Factory system, Rise of, 722. *See* Industrial Revolution
Faidherbe, and the annexation of the Senegal Valley, 373
Failly, General de, 295
Falk Laws (Prussia, *1873*, *1874*, *1875)*, 308
Far East, The, 681-705
Far Eastern Question, 680, 703. *See* Chapter XXX, 681-705
Faroe Islands, 594
Faure, Félix, President of the French Republic *(1895-1899)*, 358; death of, 361
Favre, Jules, and the proclamation of the French Republic, 297-298
February Revolution *(1848)* in France, Influence of, in Europe, 145
Federal Act of the Congress of Vienna, 32, 35, 38
Federation (British Imperial). *See* Imperial
Fenian Movement, 470, 528
Ferdinand of Saxe-Coburg, Prince of Bulgaria, elected Prince of Bulgaria *(1887)*, 630; election of, recognized by the Great Powers *(1896)*, 631; proclaims complete independence of Bulgaria, October 5, *1908*, and assumes the title of King, 631, 639
Ferdinand I, Emperor of Austria, *1835-1848*, 27, 152; dissolves Hungarian parliament, 178; flees to Olmütz, 178; abdication of, 179
Ferdinand I, King of Naples, treaty of, with Austria, 53; character of, 56; at Florence, 60
Ferdinand II, King of Naples, proclaims a constitution, 167; 181; 220
Ferdinand VII, King of Spain, restoration of *(1814)*, 46-50; character of, 46; abolishes Constitution of *1812*, 47; persecutes Liberals, 47; disintegration of the Spanish Empire under, 48-49, 565; Revolution of *1820*, 49-50; proclaims Constitution of *1812*, 50; absolutism of, restored by France, 63; revenge of, after *1823*, 564; promulgates the Pragmatic Sanction of *1789 (1830)*, 565; death of *(1833)*, 566
Ferrara, Pius IX protests against Austrian occupation of, 166
Ferry, Jules, and the proclamation of the French Republic, 297; 351; minister of public instruction, 353; prime minister, *1881*, *1883-1885*, his colonial policy, 353; overthrow of, 355; sends troops into Tunis *(1881)*, 374
Fichte, 44
Field, Cyrus, and the Atlantic Cable, 460
Fielden, and the child labor agitation, 442
Fieschi, attempt on the life of Louis Philippe, 125
Fife, 412
Figueras, 572
Final Act of Congress of Vienna, 4, 12
Finland, retained by Russia in *1815*, 8; seized by Russia, 595, 645; Russification of, 672; Nicholas II and, 678-680; abrogation of the constitution of, 679; Russia makes concessions to, 713; the Viborg Manifesto, 715; Nicholas II restores the liberties of *(1905)*, 717; Parliament of, altered, 718; conditions in *(1909)*, 718
Flocon, 188
Florence, overthrow of Republic of, 182; capital of Italy, *1865-1871*, 378
Florida, 64
Foochow, opened to British trade by Treaty of Nanking *(1842)*, 685

Forbach, Germans defeat the French at, 296
Forey, General, 278
Formosa, China cedes, to Japan *(1895)*, 696
Forster, William Edward, in the Gladstone Ministry, *1868*, 465; Education Act of *1870*, 478-481, 513
Fouché, 27
Fox, 433; on the government of colonies, 526
France, and the restoration of Louis XVIII, 2; boundaries of, by Treaty of Paris *(1814)*, 3; Isle of, 9; burdens imposed upon, by Second Treaty of Paris *(1815)*, 13; attitude of Allies toward, 16-17; at Congress of Troppau *(1820)*, 59; at Congress of Verona *(1822)*, 62; reign of Louis XVIII, 66-83; during the Restoration, 66-99; France in *1815*, 66; the Constitutional Charter, 67-70; political parties in *(1815)*, 72-73; the White Terror in, 73; execution of Marshal Ney, 74; the King and the Chamber of Deputies, 74; period of moderate liberalism in *(1816-1820)*, 75; the allied troops evacuate, 75; reorganization of the army in *(1818)*, 76; the electoral system in, 77; the Press Law of *1819*, 78; activity of the Ultras in, 78; and the election of Grégoire, 79; and the murder of the Duke of Berry, 79; the Electoral Law of *1820* in, 80; censorship restored in, 81; invades Spain *(1823)*, 63, 82; death of Louis XVIII, 82; reign of Charles X, 83-97; policy of Charles X, 83-89; fall of Villèle Ministry, 89; ministries of Martignac and Polignac, 89-91; prorogation of Chambers and General Election, 91-92; Ordinances of July *(1830)*, 92; July Revolution, 95; abdication of Charles X, 97; Louis Philippe made King, 98; end of the Restoration, 98-99; favors election of Leopold of Coburg as King of Belgium, 104; recognizes Kingdom of Belgium, 105; attitude toward insurrection in the Papal States, 110;
France, *continued*
seizes Ancona, 111; reign of Louis Philippe, 114-144; his legal title to the throne, 115; the constitution of, revised, 116; the franchise in, lowered *(1831)*, 117; character of the July Monarchy in, 117; insecurity of the new régime, 118; the progressive and conservative parties, 119; popular unrest, 120; Casimir-Périer Ministry in, 120-122; the Legitimists, 122; Republican insurrection *(1832)*, 123; vigorous measures of the government in, 124; attempts upon the life of Louis Philippe, 125; the September Laws *(1835)*, 125; Louis Philippe and the Napoleonic legend, 127-129; rivalry of Thiers and Guizot, 130; personal government of Louis Philippe, 131; Thiers and the Eastern Question, 131; becomes patron of Mehemet Ali, 132; ignored by London Conference *(1840)*, 132; ministry of Thiers, 131-132; ministry of Guizot, 132-142; demand for electoral and parliamentary reform in, 135; rise of radicalism in, 136; growth of socialism in, 138; opposition to the policy of the government, 139-142; the "reform banquets," 140; revolution of February *(1848)*, 142, 187; abdication and flight of Louis Philippe, 142; Second Republic proclaimed, 143; effect of Revolution of *1848* on Europe, 145, 176; intervenes in Rome, 182; siege and capture of Rome, 182; Second Republic, 187-206; Provisional Government, in, 188; achievements of the Provisional Government, 189; the national workshops, 192; National Constituent Assembly, 193; riot of May 15, *1848*, 193; abolition of the national workshops, 194; the June Days *(1848)*, 194; military dictatorship of Cavaignac, 194; growing opposition to the Republic, 195; the constitution, 196-198; rise of Louis Napoleon, 198-199; Louis Napoleon elected President, 200; the legislative assembly, 201; the President and

France, *continued*
Assembly combine to crush the Republicans, *202*; Law of *1850* limiting the franchise, *202*; Louis Napoleon desires prolongation of his Presidency, 203; Assembly refuses to revise the constitution for this purpose, 203; Louis Napoleon's preparations for the coup d'état, 203; Assembly refuses Louis Napoleon's demands for the re-establishment of universal suffrage, 203; coup d'état of December 2, *1851*, 204; the "massacre of the boulevards," 205; the plébiscite intrusts Louis Napoleon with forming a constitution, 205; Louis Napoleon proclaimed Emperor Napoleon III, (December 2, *1852*), 205; the Second Empire, *1852-1870*, 206-214; programme of Napoleon III, 207; the political institutions of the Empire, 207-209; the press shackled in, 209; character of the government of, 210; economic development of, 211; general prosperity of, 212; Congress of Paris *(1856)*, 212, 220; with England and Piedmont wages war against Russia in the Crimea, 212, 219; and the Italian war of *1859*, 213, 225; defeats Austrians at Magenta and Solferino, 225; concludes peace with Austria at Villafranca, 225; annexes Savoy and Nice, 231; transformation of the Second Empire in, 272-284; effect of the Italian war upon, 272; makes secret treaty of commerce with England *(1860)*, 274; powers of Parliament in, increased, 275; rise of a Republican party in, 276; and the Mexican Expedition, 277-280; concessions to liberalism in, 280; right of interpellation granted in, 281; rise of the Third Party in, 282; transformation of the Empire completed, 283; plébiscite of May *(1870)*, 284; and the Franco-German War, 285-302; indignation of, over the candidacy of Prince Leopold for the Spanish throne, 290; and the Ems despatch, 292; declares war upon Prussia *(1870)*, 293; isolation of, 294; condition of the army, 295; numerical inferiority of the French, 295; the Germans invade, 296; defeated at Wörth, Forbach, Spicheren, Borny, Mars-la-Tours and Gravelotte, 296; battle of Sedan and the surrender of Napoleon, 297; fall of the Empire, 297; proclamation of the Republic, 297; and the Government of National Defense, 298; siege of Paris, 298-299; fall of Metz, 298; fall of Strassburg, 299; capitulation of Paris and armistice, 299; election of a National Assembly in, 299; National Assembly *(1871-1876)* meets at Bordeaux, 300; Thiers as "Chief of the Executive Power" arranges terms of peace with Bismarck, 300; Treaties of Versailles and Frankfort with Germany, 300; isolation of, by Bismarck, 320; seizes Tunis *(1881)*, 321; under the Third Republic, 329-375; the National Assembly, February, *1871*, meets at Bordeaux, 300, 329; the Commune, 330-336; Paris and the Assembly mutually suspicious, 330; Versailles declared the capital, 330; distress of the working classes in Paris, 331; revolutionary elements in Paris, 331; idea of the Commune, 332; action of the National Guard, 332; war between the Commune and the Versailles Government, 333; Government of the Commune, 333; the Commune and the National Assembly clash, 334; Government of Thiers, 336-342; Rivet Law passed by the National Assembly, 337; Thiers becomes President of the Republic, 337; liberation of the territory of, 338; reform in local government of, 339; army reform in, 339; question of the permanent form of government in, 340; the monarchist parties in, 341; resignation of Thiers, 341; MacMahon elected President, 342; the framing of the constitution, 342-351; establishment of the Septennate, 343; the Assem-

France, *continued*
bly and the Republicans in, 344; Constitution of *1875*, 345; the Senate, 345; the Chamber of Deputies, 346; the President, 346; the ministry, 347; a parliamentary republic, 348; dissolution of the National Assembly in, 348; the Republic and the Church, 349; struggle between MacMahon and the Chamber, 349; resignation of MacMahon and election of Grévy, 351; supremacy of Republican party in, 351; Republican legislation, 351-354; creation of a national system of education, 352; public works, 353; revision of the constitution *(1884)*, 353; colonial policy, 353; rise of Boulangism, 354-358; increase of the national debt, 354; demands of the Radicals, 354; discontent with the Republic, 355; Wilson scandal, 355; resignation of Grévy and election of Carnot, 355; Boulanger crisis, 356; the Republic strengthened, 357; Paris Exposition of *1889*, 357; Pope advises conciliatory policy toward the Republic in, 357; Dual Alliance with Russia *(1891)*, 357; appearance of the Socialists in, 358; assassination of Carnot *(1894)* and election of Faure, 358; death of Faure *(1899)*, 358; Dreyfus Case, 358-364; significance of the case, 364; separation of Church and State in, 364-371; formation of the "Bloc," 364; speech of Waldeck-Rousseau, Prime Minister, concerning question of Church and State *(1900)*, 365; growth of religious orders in, 365; Waldeck-Rousseau Ministry and the Law of Associations *(1901)*, 366; religious orders forbidden to engage in teaching *(1904)*, 366; the Concordat of *1801*, 367; anti-clerical legislation, 367; the clergy in the Dreyfus affair, 368; Pius X protests against President Loubet's visit to Victor Emmanuel III, 368; abrogation of the Concordat, 368; Law of *1905* and Associations of Worship, 369; opposition of Pius X, 369-370; Law

France, *continued*
of January 2, *1907*, 370; separation of Church and State in, 370; acquisition of colonies by, in the nineteenth century, 371-375; French colonial empire in *1815*, 371; conquest of Algeria, 372-373; other African conquests, 373; acquisitions in Cochin-China, Western Africa, Asia, and Madagascar, 373-375; and the Suez Canal, 488; attitude toward her colonies, 546; possessions in Africa, *1815*, 551; establishes protectorate over Tunis, *1881*, 554; acquisitions in Africa, *1884-1890*, 554; at the Conference of the Powers, *1876*, 554; at the Congress of Berlin, *1884-1885*, 555; intervenes in Egypt, 558; reasons for intervention of, in the Greek War of Independence, 608-609; and the Treaty of London, *1827*, 609; battle of Navarino, *1827*, 610; sends army into the Morea, 611; guarantees independence of Greece, 611; and the "holy places" in Palestine, 612; in the Coalition against Russia, 613; invasion of the Crimea and siege of Sebastopol, 614; Treaty of Paris, *1856*, 615; attitude of, toward the breaches of the Berlin Treaty of *1878*, 629, 640, 644; in Asia, 681; establishes trade centers at the five treaty ports of China, 686; joins England in war against China, 686; Treaty of Tientsin *(1858)*, 686, confirmed, 687; intervenes with Russia and Germany in Japan, 696; acquires a port in China by lease, 697; helps to rescue the legations in Peking *(1900)*, 698

Franchise, in Australia, 532; in Austria, reform in *(1873)*, 399; reform in *(1896)*, 401; universal *(1907)*, 402; in Belgium, 582; in Canada, Dominion of *(1867)*, 529; in Denmark, 594; in England *(1815)*, 410-415; by Reform Bill of *1832*, 437-438; by Reform Bill of *1867*, 463-464; for women, Mill's speech in favor of, 464; by Reform Bill of *1884*, 492-493; qualifications for, 495-496; for women, present

Franchise, *continued*
status of *(1909)*, 516-517; in Finland, universal *(1906)*, 718; in France, Constitutional Charter *(1814)*, 68; Electoral Law *(1817)*, 77; Electoral Law *(1820)*, 80; Electoral Law *(1831)*, 117; under the Provisional Government, 190; Law of *1850*, 202; under the Second Empire, 209; under the Third Republic, 346; in Germany, 304; in Greece, 634; in Holland *(1815)*, 579; *(1848)*, 580; by amendments to the Constitution *(1887* and *1896)*, 581; in Hungary, 404; in Iceland, 595; in Italy, reform of *(1882)*, 381; in Japan, 694; in New Zealand, 536; in Norway, 600; in Portugal, 577; in Prussia, 186, 326; in Roumania, 632; in Russia *(1909)*, 716; in Spain, universal *(1890)*, 575; in Sweden, 600; in Switzerland, 586; in Turkey *(1908)*, 642; in Union of South Africa, 544-545

Francis I, of Austria *(1768-1835)*, character of, 19; and Metternich, 25, 152

Francis II, King of Naples, Revolt against, 232; flees from Naples on advance of Garibaldi, 235; flees from Gaeta to Rome, 237

Francis Joseph I, *1848*—, accession of, 179; appeals to Nicholas I for aid against Hungary, 180; interview with Napoleon III at Villafranca, 225; alliance of the Three Emperors, 320; and the Magyars in Hungary, 388; revokes the Constitution of *1849*, 388; reverses his policy, 389; grants a constitution *(1861)*, to Austria, 390; attitude of Hungary towards, 391; yields, 393; accepts Compromise of *1867*, 393; crowned King of Hungary *(1867)*, 393; and the demands of the Czechs, 397-398; and the question of language, 404; annexes Bosnia and Herzegovina *(1908)*, 639-640

Franco-German War, 285-302

Frankfort, German National Assembly or Parliament of, 174, 175; work of, 183; rejection of the work of, 185; entered by the Prussians *(1866)*, 265; incorporated in the Prussian Kingdom, 267; Treaty of *(1871)*, 300, 338; and relation of Treaty of, to Triple Alliance, 319. *See also* Diet of Frankfort

Frankfort, *continued*

Frederick III, German Emperor, March 9-June 15, *1888*, 305; succeeds his father William I, 322; death of, 322

Frederick VI, King of Denmark *(1808-1839)*, loses Norway, 592; establishes consultative assemblies, *1834*, 592

Frederick VII, King of Denmark *(1848-1863)*, 257; grants constitution *(1849)* to the Islands and Jutland, 593; grants constitutions of *1854* and *1855*, 593; and Schleswig-Holstein, 593

Frederick VIII, King of Denmark, *1906*—, 595

Frederick William III, King of Prussia *(1797-1840)*, character of, 19; becomes reactionary, 38-43; government of, 146-149; death of *(1840)*, 149

Frederick William IV, King of Prussia *(1840-1861)*, character of, 149; issues the Letter Patent of February *(1847)*, 151; conflict with the United Landtag, 152; promises to call a representative assembly to draw up a constitution, 174; offered leadership in Germany, 184; declines the offer, 185; the "humiliation of Olmütz," 185; grants constitution of *1850*, 185-186; becomes reactionary, 241; William I becomes Regent for, 247; death of, 247

Free Trade, in England, Bismarck on, 310-312; 450-455, 548

Freiburg, 590

French Congo, founded, 353

French Constitution of *1791*, 46, 576

French Guiana, 359

French Revolution *(1789)*, effects of, in France, 66; influence of, shown in the Constitutional Charter, 69; loss of French colonies as a result of, 371; effect of, upon England, 417, 519

French Soudan, 374
Freytag, 246
Fujiyama, 687
Fulton, and the *Clermont*, 723
Fundamental Law of *1815* (Holland), 579

Gaeta, Francis II flees to, 235, 236; siege of, 237; fall of, 237
Gag Laws or Six Acts (England), *1819*, 422
Galicia, 62; position in the Austrian Empire *(1861)*, 390; Poles in, favored by Taaffe Ministry, 400
Galvani, 386
Galway, 484; college at, 516
Gambetta, Léon *(1840-1882)*, emergence of, 281; denounces Napoleon III, 282; 284; votes against war with Prussia, 293; proclaims the French Republic after the surrender of the Emperor at Sedan, 297; escapes from Paris and organizes new armies, 298; defeated, 329; attitude toward the Communists, 336; and the Republic, 344; attitude toward the Roman Catholic Church, 349, 366; Broglie Ministry against, 350; president of the Chamber of Deputies, 351; death of *(1882)*, 355
Gapon, Father, 710
Garibaldi, Giuseppe, *1807-1882*, joins Young Italy, 162; attitude toward Cavour after the cession of Nice, 231; early life, 232; and the defense of Rome, 233; determines to go to Sicily, 233; and Cavour, 234; conquers Sicily and assumes the dictatorship, 235; conquers Naples, 235; proposes to attack Rome, 235; requests Victor Emmanuel to dismiss Cavour, 237; meeting with Victor Emmanuel, 237; retires to Caprera, 237
Gastein, Convention of, 259, 261
Gatton, 413
General Strike, The resort to the, in Russia *(1905)*, 711-712
Geneva Commission, *1872*, 486, 591
Genoa, Republic of, incorporated in Sardinia, 3, 5, 52; *"The Thousand"* embark from, 234
Gentz, 15
George, Prince, son of George I of Greece, administrator of Crete, 635
George I, King of Greece, *1863* —, 634-635; acquires the Ionian Islands, *1864*, 634; acquires Thessaly, *1881*, 634
George I, of England, Elector of Hanover, 446
George III *(1760-1820)*, death of, 422; opposition to Catholic Emancipation, 426; 445; and New South Wales, 531
George IV *(1820-1830)*, accession of, 422; opposition to Catholic Emancipation, 426; and the Catholic Emancipation Act, 428; death of, 428
German Confederation, organized by the Congress of Vienna *(1815)*, 29; the Diet of, 29-30; international character of, 31-32; and Metternich, 35, 173; restored *(1851)*, 185, 388; Holstein a part of, 257; Bismarck proposes a reform of, 262; Prussia withdraws from, 263; declared dissolved by Prussia, 263; ceases to exist, 267-268
German East Africa, 319
German Empire, 303-328. *See* Germany
German Southwest Africa, 319
Germany, and the Treaty of Paris *(1814)*, 3; the Metternich system in, 28, 35; reaction in, 28-44; varieties of states in, 29; Act of Federation of, at the Congress of Vienna, 29, 32; the Diet of the Confederation of, 29-30; international character of, 31-32; problem of unity in, 32-36; demand for constitutional government in, 35-37; the King of Prussia becomes reactionary, 38; ferment in the universities of, 39; Wartburg Festival, 39; murder of Kotzebue, 40; decrees of the conference of Carlsbad, 41-44; influence of July Revolution *(1830)* in, 100; revolution *(1830)* in, 112; new measures of repression, 112; Metternich supreme in, 113; revolution *(1848)* in, 173; *Vorparlament*, 174; Parliament of Frankfort, 174; March *(1848)* revolutions tri-

Germany, *continued*
umphant in, 174; work of the Frankfort Parliament, 183; leadership in, offered to the King of Prussia, 184; the offer declined, 185; rejection of the work of the Frankfort Parliament, 185; and the "humiliation of Olmütz," 185; Austria demands that the old German Confederation of *1815* be revived in *(1851)*, 185; reaction in, after *1849*, 240-243; emigration from, 241; economic transformation of 243; industrial development of, 244; rise of a wealthy middle class in, 245; intellectual activity in, 245; influence of events in Italy upon thought in, 246; founding of the National Union in, 246; Bismarck's plan for unity in, 255-256; and Schleswig-Holstein, 256-267; and the Danish war, 258; friction between Austria and Prussia, 259; Convention of Gastein, 259; war between Austria and Prussia, 263-267; Treaty of Prague, 263, 267; North German Confederation formed, 268; organization and government of, 269; alliance with South German States, 270; consolidation of the new system in, 270; South German States join Prussia in war against France, 293; Franco-German war, 293-299; invasion of France, 296; Germans defeat French at Wörth, Forbach, Spicheren, Borny, Mars-la-Tours, and Gravelotte, 296; Union of Northern and Southern States completes German unification, 301; King William I becomes Emperor in, 301; growth of national feeling in, since *1815*, 303; constitution of the new German Empire, 303-305; and the Roman Catholic Church, 306; the Kulturkampf in, 306-310; causes of the Kulturkampf, 306; formation of the Center Party, 307; Dogma of Papal Infallibility, 307; the Old Catholics, 307; the Falk Laws, 308; conflict of Church and State, 308; Falk Laws suspended *(1879)*, 309; rescinded *(1886)*, 309; religious orders except Jesuits permitted to return to *(1887)*, 309; adopts the policy of protection, 310; growth of Socialism in, 312; attempts upon the life of the Emperor, 313; measures against the Socialists, 313; failure of these measures and continued growth of the Socialist party in, 314; the Imperial Government of, undertakes social reform, 315; Sickness Insurance Law *(1883)*, Accident Insurance Laws *(1884* and *1885)*, Old Age Insurance Law *(1889)*, 316; a colonial empire results from the adoption of the policy of protection in, 318; colonies in Africa, 319; alliance of the Three Emperors, 320; Austro-German Treaty of *1879*, 321; Triple Alliance *(1882)*, 321, 382; death of William I, 322; accession and death of Frederick III, 322; accession of William II, 322; Anti-Socialist policy abandoned, 323; expansion of German industry, 324; as a naval power, 324; continued growth of socialism in, 324; the Social Democratic party numerically the largest in, 325; demand for electoral reform in Prussia, 326; demand for parliamentary reform in, 326; demand for ministerial responsibility in, 327; the present situation in *(1909)*, 328; troops withdrawn from France (*1871-1873)*, 338; emigration from, ceases *(1908)*, 386; attitude toward her colonies, 546; growth of, 546; acquisitions in Africa, *1884-1890*, 554; at the Conference of the Powers, *1876*, 554; at the Conference of Berlin, *1884-1885*, 555; and the Congress of Berlin *(1878)*, 625-626; attitude of, toward the breaches of the Berlin Treaty *(1878)*, 629, 640; intervenes with Russia and France in Japan, 696; establishes a "sphere of influence" in China *(1898)*, 697; helps to rescue the legations in Peking *(1900)*, 698

Gioberti, *1801-1852*, 164-165; author of *"The Moral and Civil Primacy of the Italians,"* 164

Gladstone, William Ewart, *1809-1898*, denounces the Neapolitan government, 215; and the tariff, 455; Chancellor of the Exchequer *(1852-1855, 1859-1866)* and his policy, 459; and Postal Savings Banks *(1862)*, 459; and State Insurance *(1864)*, 459; introduces Reform Bill of *1866*, which is defeated, 461-462; and the Reform Bill of *1867*, 463; early life of, 465; enters Parliament *(1833)*, 466; leader of the Liberal Party, 466; First Ministry of *(1868-1874)*, 466; and Ireland, 467; Reforms of;—disestablishment of the Anglican Church in Ireland *(1869)*, 472; Irish Land Act of *1870*, 475; Forster Education Act of *1870*, 478; abolition of the purchase system in the army *(1871)*, 482; Civil Service reform *(1870)*, 482; Ballot Law of *1872*, 483-484;—waning popularity of, 484; Irish University Bill of *1873* defeated, 485; resigns but returns to office, 485; unpopularity of the foreign policy of, 486; and the Alabama award, 486; fall of ministry of, 486; Second Ministry of, *1880-1885*, 490-496; Reform Bill of *1884*, 492; Redistribution Act of *1885*, 493; fall of the ministry of, *1885*, 497; and the Irish Home Rule Movement, 497-499; Third Ministry of *(1886)*, 499; introduces the Home Rule Bill, 500; and the Land Purchase Bill, 501; and the defeat of the Home Rule Bill, 504; dissolves Parliament, appeals to the people and is defeated, 504; Fourth Ministry of *(1892-1894)*, 507-510; introduces Second Home Rule Bill *(1893)*, 507-509; Parish Councils Bill of *1894*, 509; resigns *(1894)*, 510; on the House of Lords, 510; death of *(1898)*, 510; policy of, in South Africa, 539; and the Pretoria Convention of *1881*, 540; and the London Convention of *1884*, 540; and Egypt, 560-561; denounces the Turks, *622*

Glasgow, gain of, in House of Commons by Redistribution Act of *1885*, 494

Gneisenau, 44

Gneist, estimate of, concerning cultivable land in the United Kingdom, 412

Goethe, on Frederick William IV, 149

Gogol, 653

Gordon, General, in the Soudan, 561-562; death of, *562*

Goremykin, Prime Minister, issues in the name of the Tsar the "organic laws," 713; 715

Görgei, Hungarian commander, capitulates at Világos, 180

Gortchakoff, Russian Chancellor, on the Congress of Berlin, 320

Goschen, George Joachim, in the Gladstone Ministry, *1868*, 465; becomes a Liberal-Unionist, 504

Gotha, Socialist programme of *1875*, adopted at, 312

Gramont, Duke of, and the Spanish candidacy of Prince Leopold, 290-291

Granville, Lord, on England and Egypt, 560

Grattan, 498

Gravelotte, Germans defeat French at, *296*

Great Britain. *See* England

Great Western, sails from Bristol to New York, 724

Greece, War of Independence of, 604-611; condition of the Greeks *(1820)*, 604; intellectual revival in, 605; the Hetairia Philike founded in *(1814)*, 605; character of the war in *(1821-1829)*, 606; foreign intervention in, 607-609; and the battle of Navarino *(1827)*, 610; creation of the Kingdom of, 611; opposes the Treaty of San Stefano *(1878)*, 624; and the Congress of Berlin *(1878)*, 626; since *1833*, 633-636; reign of Otto I, 633-634; the monarchy of, becomes constitutional *(1844)*, 634; England cedes the Ionian Islands to, *1864*, 634; Constitution of *1864*, 634; annexes Thessaly, *1881*, 634; declares war against Turkey, *(1897)*, is defeated and loses parts of Thessaly, 635; and Crete, 635; present condition of, 635; aspirations of, 635; Crete declares for union with, *1908*, 639

Greek Church, Ecclesiastics of, hanged, 606; in Russia, 645; Alexander III and, 670
Greenland, 594
Grégoire, elected to French Chamber of Deputies, is excluded, 79
Grévy, Jules, proposition of, concerning the Presidency of the Second Republic, 197; elected President of the Third Republic, 351; forced to resign, 355
Grey, Earl, Prime Minister, and the First Reform Bill, 430; resigns, 436; recalled and given power to create Peers to pass the Reform Bill, 436; succeeded by Lord Melbourne, 451
Grey, Sir Edward, British Foreign Minister, on the infraction of the Berlin Treaty of *1878 (1908)*, 641
Grote, and the secret ballot, 483
Guadaloupe, French possession *(1815)*, 371
Guam, 319
Guiana, in South America, French possession, *1815*, 371; part of Dutch, acquired by England, 519
Guinea, French annexations in, 374
Guizot, Courses of, suspended, 86; reinstated, 89; and the conservative party, 120; rivalry of Thiers and, 130; ministry of *(1840-1848)*, 133-142; observation of, concerning Cavour, 232; on the Ollivier Ministry and the Hohenzollern candidacy, 292
Gustavus IV, King of Sweden, 11
Gustavus V, King of Sweden, *1907*—, 600

Haakon VII, King of Norway, *1905*—, 600
Habeas Corpus Act, suspension of, in England, *1817*, 421; suspension of, in Ireland, 470
Hadley, A. T., on the importance of railroads, 725
Hague, The, Norway and Sweden and the International Arbitration Tribunal at, 600; First Peace Conference *(1899)*, 730-733; Second Peace Conference *(1907)*, 734-735
Hallam, Arthur, and Gladstone at Eton, 465
Ham, Louis Napoleon Bonaparte imprisoned at, 129, 199, 278
Hamburg, member of the North German Confederation, 268; member of German Empire, 304; merchants of, establish trading stations, 318
Hamburg-American steamship line, established *(1847)*, 724
Hanotaux, description of the "bloody week" in Paris, 335, 336; on the constitution of *1875*, 348
Hanover, importance of, in the German Diet, 30; a possession of the English royal family, 31; form of government in, 36; and the Zollverein, 149; the National Union founded in, 246; supports Austria in the war of *1866*, 263; conquered by Prussia, 264-265; King of, taken prisoner, 264; incorporated in the Prussian Kingdom, 267; England loses, 446
Hanseatic towns, 149
Hapsburg, House of, advantages gained at the Congress of Vienna, 8; ancient possessions of, 23; Hungary renounces allegiance to, 179; territorial gains and losses of, 404
Harbin, 697, 699
Harcourt, Sir William Vernon, and the budget of *1894*, 511
Hargreaves, 407, 722
Harrow, 477
Hartington, Lord (later Duke of Devonshire) becomes a Liberal-Unionist, 504
Haussmann, Baron, beautifies Paris, 212
Hedley, William, constructs the *Puffing Billy*, 724
Heidelberg, Liberals at, call the *Vorparlament*, 174
Heligoland, retained by England in *1815*, 9, 519
Helmholtz, 246
Henry, Colonel, and the Dreyfus Case, 359; commits suicide, 361
Herzegovina occupied by Austria, 320; gained by Austria-Hungary, 404; formally annexed by Austria-Hungary *(1908)*, 405, 639-640; insurrection of, *1875*, 620

Hesse-Cassel, revolutionary movements in *(1830)*, 112; supports Austria in the war of *1866*, 263; Elector of, taken prisoner by Prussia, 264; incorporated in the Prussian Kingdom, 267
Hesse-Darmstadt, granted constitution *(1820)*, 37; supports Austria in the war of *1866*, 263
Hetairia Philike *(1814)*, 605
Hohenlohe, German Chancellor, *1894-1900*, 323
Hohenzollern, The Spanish candidacy of Leopold of, 290-292; 619
Holland, acquisitions of, by Treaty of Paris *(1814)*, 3; King of, a member of the German Confederation, 31; and the Congress of Vienna, 101; and the Belgians, 101-104; influence of the July Revolution *(1830)* in, 103; Belgium becomes a kingdom independent of, 105; New, 531; England seizes Cape Colony, a possession of, 536; stations of, in Africa *(1815)*, 551; since *1830*, 579-581; rulers in, since *1830*, 579; Fundamental Law of *1815* in, 579; Constitution of *1848* in, 580; extension of the franchise in, 581; colonies of, 581; establishes trade centers at the five treaty ports of China, 686; obtains a trading station on the peninsula of Deshima, 690; *also called* The Netherlands
Holstein, member of German Diet, 31, 257. *See* Schleswig-Holstein
Holy Alliance *(1815)*, Alexander I and, 14, 649; composition and character of, 14-16; and Metternich, 18; converted into an engine of oppression, 40; triumph of, in Naples, Piedmont, and Spain, 63, 564; and the Spanish-American colonies, 64-65; powerlessness of *(1830)*, 100; England's defiance of, 422, 608
Holy Roman Empire, 29, 35
Holyrood Palace, 98
Home Government Association of Ireland. *See* Home Rule (Ireland)
Home Rule (Ireland), Movement, 492; Party formed, 497; leaders of, party adopt policy of obstruction, 498; party holds balance of power *(1886)*, 500; First Bill for *(1886)*, 500-504; Second Bill for *(1893)*, 507-509
Hong Kong, ceded to England by China *(1842)*, 685
"*Hopes of Italy*" *(1844)* by Cesare Balbo, 165
Hôtel de Ville, Lafayette and Louis Philippe *(1830)* at, 97; meeting place of Provisional Government, 144, 191; proclamation of the French Republic at, 297
"*House of Commons, The Rotten*," by Lovett, 447
Hudson Bay territory, English possession, 519, 523; purchased by the Dominion of Canada, *1869*, 529
Hugo, Victor, 275
Humbert I, King of Italy *(1878-1900)*, succeeds his father, Victor Emmanuel II, 380; reforms under, 381; and the Triple Alliance *(1882)*, 382; assassination of *(1900)*, 384
Hundred Days, 13
Hungarian Constitution before *1848*, 155
Hungary, a part of the Austrian Empire, 23; races in, 24; government of, 26; national and racial movement in, 154; constitution of, before *1848*, 155; importance of the nobility in, 155; feudalism in, 155; Széchenyi and reform in, 156; the language question in the Diet of, 157; rise of a radical party in, 157; Kossuth, 158; demands of the Hungarians in *1847*, 159; the decisive intervention of, 169; Kossuth's speech against Austria, 169; Diet of, passes the March Laws, 170; becomes practically independent, 171; civil dissension in, 176; Austria exploits the situation in, 177; radical party in, seizes control, 178; declares Francis Joseph a usurper, 179; war with Austria, 179; declares her independence, 179; conquered, 180; constitutional rights of, abolished, 180; Austria's vengeance in, 180; attitude toward Austria in the Austro-Prussian War *(1866)*, 266; Aus-

Hungary, *continued*
tria's punishment of, 388; position of, in the Empire *(1861)*, 390; refuses to coöperate with Austria, 390; asserts her "historic rights," 391; demands restoration of her constitution of *1848*, 392; Compromise of *1867*, 393-396; Francis Joseph crowned King of *(1867)*, 393; constitution *(1848)* restored, 395; Magyars, the dominant race in, 395; divisive effect of the principle of nationality in, 396; opposition of Magyars to the demands of the Czechs in, 398; Kingdom of, since *1867*, 402-405; the Magyars and the policy of Magyarization, 403; the Croatians in, 403; race questions in, 403; struggle over the question of language in, 404; suffrage in, 404. *See* Austria-Hungary
Hunt, at Peterloo, 421; speech on the Reform Bill, 433
Huskisson, 422; economic reforms of, 423; reform in Navigation Laws, *1823-1825*, 451

Ibrahim, son of Mehemet Ali, 602; conquers Morea for Turkey, 607; and the battle of Navarino, *1827*, 610
Iceland, 594; granted home rule *(1874)*, 595
Ilchester, Borough of, 433
Illiteracy, in Italy, 381; decline of, in England, 515; in Spain, 575
Illyrian Provinces, given to Austria by Congress of Vienna, 8
Imperial Federation (England), 545-549; problem of, and its increasing importance, 546; difficulties in the way of, 547; colonial conferences and, 548; confederations within the Empire, 549
Imperialism, in England, 487; Joseph Chamberlain and, 511
India, French possessions *(1815)* in, 371; Civil Service in, 482; Queen of England proclaimed Empress of *(1877)*, 489, 522; English possessions in, prior to *1815*, 519; work of the East India Company in, 519-520;
India, *continued*
overthrow of the Mahratta confederacy in *(1816-1818)* 520; England annexes the Punjab in *(1845-1849)*, 520; Sepoy Mutiny in *(1857)*, 520-521; government of, transferred to the Crown *(1858)*, 522; declared an Empire *(1876)*, 522; government of, 522; population of, 522; and the South African War *(1899)*, 544; and the Opium War, 685
Indian Mutiny, 521
Indian Ocean, French colonial expansion in, under the Third Republic, 373; French colony of Madagascar in, 374
Indo-China, French colonial expansion in, under the Third Republic, 373, 681
Industrial Legislation;—in France, under the Provisional Government *(1848)*, 191-192;—in England, agitation for improved conditions of labor by Owen, Sadler, Fielden, and Ashley, 442; Factory Act of *1833*, 442; Labor in Mines Act of *1842*, 455; Factory Acts of *1844*, *1847*, and *1850*, 456; Factory and Workshop Consolidation Act of *1878*, 456; Act *(1889)* regulating the employment of women and children, 506-507; Factory and Workshop Act of *1901*, 457;—in New Zealand, 535-536
Industrial Revolution, in France, 137; in Austria, 153; in Germany, 244; in England, 406-409; in Russia, 673-676; rise of the factory system, 722
Inglis, Sir Robert, speech of, in opposition to the Reform Bill, 432; Macaulay's reply to, 434
Inheritance tax, in England, 511; in New Zealand, 535
Initiative, The, in Switzerland, 589-590
Inkermann, battle of, 614
Inquisition, The, in Spain, 47; in the States of the Church, 55
Institute of Mining Engineers at St. Petersburg, Resolution of, on the war with Japan, 706-707
Insurance Laws, Germany, Sickness *(1883)*, Accident *(1884* and *1885)*, Old Age *(1889)*, 316

Insurance, State, Germany and, 315-316; Austria and, 400; England and, 459, 515-516; New Zealand and, 535-536; Denmark and, 594
Interpellation, Right of, granted in France *(1867)*, 281
Intervention, Doctrine of the right of, 58-60; application of, *see also* Congresses and Holy Alliance
Ionian Islands, occupied by England, 9; protectorate of England over, 519; England cedes, to Greece, *1864*, 634
Ireland, Representation in House of Commons *(1815)*, 410; suffrage in, 426; O'Connell founds the Catholic Association in, 427; O'Connell elected to Parliament from County of Clare, 427; restriction of the suffrage in, 428; given increased representation, 437; famine of *1845-1847*, 453, 469; Reform Bill *(1868)* for, 464; Gladstone and, 467; condition *(1815)* in, 467-469; Catholic Emancipation Act *(1829)*, 469; franchise qualification in, raised, 469; Repeal agitation in, 469; O'Connell and the Irish party in, 469; Young Ireland, 469; decline of the population in, 470; and the Fenian Movement, 470; suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act in, 470; the Irish Church, 468, 471; the tithe war in, 472; disestablishment of the Irish Church *(1869)*, 472; system of land tenure in, 472-474; misery of the peasants in, 474; the Ulster system of land tenure in, 475; Land Act of *1870*, 475-477; Irish University Bill of *1873* defeated, 485; failure of the Land Act of *1870*, 490; the Three F's, Land Act of *1881* and the Land Court, 491; Reform Bill *(1884)* for, 493; and the Home Rule Movement, 497; Home Rulers hold balance of power *(1886)*, 500; First Home Rule Bill *(1886)*, 500-504; Land Purchase Bill introduced, *1886*, 501; policy of coercion for, under the Second Salisbury Ministry, 505; Land Purchase Act, *1891*, 505-506; Land Act of
Ireland, *continued*
1903, 506; Second Home Rule Bill *(1893)*, 507-509; Land Purchase Act of *1896*, 512; Local Government Act *(1898)*, 512; Old Age Pensions Law in, 516; Irish University or Birrell Act *(1908)*, 516
Irish Church, position of, in *1815*, 468, 471; and the Tithe War, 472; disestablishment of *(1869)*, 472
Irish Local Government Act, *1898*, 512
Irish University, established *(1908)* by the Birrell Act, 516
Isabella II, of Spain *(1833-1868)*, daughter of Ferdinand VII, proclaimed Queen, 566; declared of age *(1843)*, 568; absolutism of, 569; overthrow of, 290, 569; abdicates in favor of her son Alfonso, 570
Islands, The, of Denmark, Frederick VI grants a consultative assembly to, 592; Frederick VII grants a constitution *(1849)* to, 593
Isle of France, retained by England in *1815*, 9
Ismail, Viceroy of Egypt, *1863-1866*, Khedive of Egypt *1866-1879*, extravagance of, 558; sells shares in the Suez Canal Company to England *(1875)*, 558; abdicates, 559
Italian War of *1859*, 213, 225-229
Italy, decision of the Congress of Vienna concerning, 8-10, 52; the Metternich system in, 28; reaction and revolution in, 50-62; Napoleon on Italian unity, 50; significance of Napoleon's activity in, 51; awakening of, 51-52; dominance of Austria in, 53-54; government in, 53-56; the Carbonari in, 56; revolution in Naples *(1820)*, 57; revolution in Piedmont *(1821)*, 61; influence of the July Revolution *(1830)* in, 100; revolutions in, 110-112; conditions in, after the revolutions of *1820*, 110; revolutionary movements *(1831)* in, 110; Austrian intervention in, 111; the French seize Ancona, 111; results of the insurrections in, 111-112; *1830-1848*, 159-168;

Italy, *continued*
after *1831*, 159; Mazzini, 160-164; Young Italy, 161; Gioberti, 164-165; D'Azeglio, 165; Balbo, 165; the Risorgimento, 166; election and policy of Pius IX in, 166; reforms in Tuscany and Piedmont, 167; revolution in the Kingdom of Naples *(1848)*, 167; revolution in Lombardy-Venetia, 172; renounces Austrian control, 173; March *(1848)* revolutions triumphant in, 174; partially conquered, 175; battle of Custozza *(1848)* in, 176; conquest of, completed, 181; battle of Novara, 181; French intervention in Rome, 182; fall of Venice, 182; reaction in, after *1848*, 215; Victor Emmanuel II, King of Piedmont, and the making of the Kingdom of, 216; Cavour, 216-239; Piedmont joins England and France in a war against Russia in the Crimea, 219; the Congress of Paris discusses the question of, 220; campaign of *1859* in, 225, 389; battles of Magenta and Solferino, 225; Peace of Villafranca, 225; situation in Central, 228; England's participation in affairs in, 229; Modena, Parma, Tuscany, and the Romagna added to the Kingdom of Piedmont, 230; cession of Savoy and Nice to France *(1860)*, 231; Sicily and Naples conquered by Garibaldi in the name of Victor Emmanuel II, 234-235; Piedmontese troops enter the Marches and Umbria, 236; annexation of the Kingdom of Naples and of Umbria and the Marches to Piedmont, 236; all, excepting Rome and Venice, united under Victor Emmanuel II *(1861)*, 237; Bismarck's treaty of alliance with, 261; and the war of *1866*, 263; battle of Custozza *(1866)*, 265; Venetia ceded to *(1866)*, 267, 376; neutrality of, in Franco-German War, 294; takes possession of Rome *(1870)*, 301; completion of unification of, 301; Kingdom of, 376-387; difficulties confronting the new kingdom of, 376; the constitution of, 377; and the question of the Papacy, 378; Law of Papal Guarantees, 378; the Curia Romana, 379; financial status of, 380; death of Victor Emmanuel II *(1878)* and accession of his son Humbert I, 380; the educational problem in, 380; compulsory education laws, *1877* and *1904* in, 381; extension of the suffrage *(1882)* in, 381; and the Triple Alliance *(1882)*, 321, 382; Depretis Ministry, 382; Crispi ministries, 382-383; colonial policy, 382; economic distress, 383; riots of *(1889)* in, 383; policy of repression, 383, and the war with Abyssinia *(1896)*, 383; Rudini Ministry, 383; riots of May *(1898)* in, 383; assassination of Humbert I *(1900)*, 384; accession and character of Victor Emmanuel III, 384; increasing prosperity of, 384-387; emigration from, to South America and the United States, 386; growth of, 546; acquisitions of, in Africa *(1884-1890)*, 554; at the Conference of the Powers *(1876)*, 554; at the Berlin Conference *(1884-1885)*, 555; attitude of, toward the breaches of the Berlin Treaty of *1878*, 629, 640

Ito, Count, 694

Jahn, persecution of, 43; released, 150

Jamaica, slavery abolished in *(1833)*, 442; English possession, 519

Jameson, Dr., 542

Janina, Ali of, 602

Japan, the country and its civilization, 687-688; the government of, 688-689; advent of Europeans in, 689; adopts policy of isolation, 690; treaty with the United States *(1854)*, 691; abolition of the Shogunate in, 692; transformation of, 692; abolition of the old régime *(1871)*, 693; adopts European institutions, 693-694; becomes a constitutional state, 694; drives the Chinese from Korea *(1894)* and invades Manchuria, 695; Treaty

Japan, *continued*
of Shimonoseki *(1895)*, 695-696; intervention of Russia, France, and Germany, 696; relinquishes Port Arthur and the Liao-tung peninsula, 696; helps to rescue the legations in Peking, 698; Anglo-Japanese Treaty of *1902*, 700; makes war upon Russia *(1904-1905)*, 701-702; Port Arthur surrenders to, 702; captures Mukden, 702; destroys Russian fleet, 702; signs Treaty of Portsmouth *(1905)*, 702-703; and Korea, 703 *note*
Java, 581
Jeffrey, Francis, on the steam engine, 408
Jellachich, appointed governor of Croatia, 177; begins civil war, 178; given command of all the Austrian troops in Hungary, 178; victories of, 179
Jena, Students of, and the Burschenschaft, 39
Jesuits, in Spain, 47; in Piedmont, 54; in France, 86; in Germany, 306; expelled from Germany, 308; expelled from France *(1880)*, 353; suppressed in Spain, 569; expelled from Switzerland, 586
Jews, admitted to the House of Commons, 458; persecution of, in Russia, 672
Johannesburg, 541
John VI, King of Portugal, flees to Brazil, *1807*, 575; returns to Portugal and accepts the Constitution of *1822*, 576; death of, *1826*, 576
Joseph, brother of Napoleon I, 45, 574
Joseph II, of Austria, 24
Josephine, Empress, 90, 127
Juarez, President of Mexico, 277, 279
July Monarchy, 114-144. *See* Louis Philippe
July Ordinances *(1830)*, 92; withdrawn, 96
July Revolution of *1830*, 95; widespread influence of, 100; in Belgium, 103-104; in Poland, 108; in Italy, 110; in Germany, 112
June Days (*1848*, France), 194
Jutland, Frederick VI grants a consultative assembly to, 592;
Jutland, *continued*
Frederick VII grants a constitution *(1849)* to, 593

Kagoshima, 691
Kamerun, German colony in Africa, 319
Kara George, revolt of the Servians under *1804*, 604; murder of, *1817*, 604; House of, 633
Kars, 626
Kent, Duke of, father of Queen Victoria, 445
Khartoum, 561-562
Kiauchau, 697
Kiel, 259; Treaty of *(1814)*, 592, 598
Kioto, 688; Mikado leaves, 692; University established at, 693
Kissingen, battle of, 265
Kitchener, Lord, in the South African War *(1899-1902)*, 543-544; recovers the Soudan, *1896-1898*, 562
Königgrätz, or Sadowa, battle of, between Prussia and Austria *(1866)*, 265; importance of, to France, 288
Koraes, edits the Greek classics, 605
Korea, and the Chino-Japanese War *(1894)*, 695; China recognizes the complete independence of, 696; Japan's apprehension concerning, 699; the Anglo-Japanese Treaty of *1902* and, 700; Japanese armies enter, 701; Russo-Japanese War in *(1904-1905)*, 701-702; by the Treaty of Portsmouth *(1905)* Russia recognizes Japan's paramount interests in, 702; Japan and, 703 *note*
Kossuth, Francis, son of Louis Kossuth, and his party, 404
Kossuth, Louis, leader of the liberal party in Hungary, 157; speech in the Diet *(1848)*, 169; comes into power, 178; appointed President of Hungary, 179; resigns in favor of Görgei, 180; flees to Turkey, 180
Kotzebue, murder of, 40, 649
Kruger, Paul, 538
Krupp, Alfred, 244
Kulturkampf, 306-309
Kuropatkin, General, 701

Labourdonnaye, Minister of the Interior, 90
Ladrone Islands, purchased by Germany from Spain *(1899)*, 319
Lafayette, elected to the Chamber of Deputies, 78; a leader of the Republicans in the July Revolution *(1830)*, 97, 123; and the progressive party, 119; and the Greek War of Independence, 608
Laffitte, and the progressive party in France, 119, 130
Laharpe, Colonel, tutor of Alexander I of Russia, 646
Laibach, Congress of *(1821)*, 60
La Marmora, General, *222*
Lamarque, General, 123
Lamartine, 129, 136; emergence of, 141; leader of the Republicans in the Provisional Government, 143, 188; on the question of the flag, 190; head of the executive of the National Constituent Assembly, 193; on the mode of electing the president, 197; candidate for the presidency of the Republic, 200
Lancashire, boroughs of, 433; gain in House of Commons by Redistribution Act of *1885*, 494
Land Acts (Ireland), *1870*, 475-477; failure of, 490; *1881*, 491, 499; proposed *1886*, 501, 505; *1891*, 505-506; *1896*, 512; *1903*, 506
Land Court (Ireland), 491
Landesgemeinde cantons, 588
Langensalza, battle of, Hanoverians defeat the Prussians at, 264
Lassalle, Ferdinand, founds the Socialist party in Germany, 312; founds a journal, the *Social Democrat (1865)*, 312; reading of his works prohibited, 314
Lateran, 379
Lauenburg, Denmark renounces all rights to, 259; bought by Prussia, 260
Law of Associations, *1901* (France), 366
Law of Papal Guarantees *(1871)*, 378
Lebœuf, Marshal (Minister of War), 295
Ledru-Rollin, Socialist candidate for the presidency of the Second Republic, 200
Leeds, unrepresented in Parliament *(1815)*, 414
Legations, The, 223
Legitimacy, Principle of, at Congress of Vienna, 5-6; disregarded, 11
Legitimists (France), 122
Legnago, 173
Leipsic, retained by King of Saxony at Congress of Vienna, 8; celebration of anniversary of, at Wartburg, 39; battle of, compared with Königgrätz, 265
Leo XIII, Pope, *1878-1903*, election of, 309, 380; advises conciliatory policy toward the Third Republic (France), *1893*, 357, 368; attitude toward the Law of Papal Guarantees *(1871)*, 379
Leopold of Coburg, elected King of Belgium, 104. *See* Leopold I, King of Belgium
Leopold, Prince of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, candidacy of, for the throne of Spain, *1869-1870*, 290, 570, withdrawn, 291, 570
Leopold I, King of Belgium, *1831-1865*, 279; and the political education of Queen Victoria, 445; reign of, 581-582
Leopold II, King of Belgium, *1865-1909*, and the Congo Free State, 554-557; calls a conference of the Powers, *1876*, 554; Congress of Berlin, *1884-1885*, 555; criticism of his administration, 556; death of, 582
Lesseps, Ferdinand de, and the Suez Canal, 558
Letter Patent of February, *1847* (Prussia), 151
Liao-tung peninsula, Japan occupies, 695; China cedes, to Japan *(1895)*, 696; Japan relinquishes, 696; the Japanese invade, 701; Russia transfers, to Japan *(1905)*, 703
Liao-yang, battle of, 702
Liebknecht, Socialist leader, 313
Liechtenstein, 30
Lin, Chinese Viceroy, and the Opium War *(1840-1842)*, 685
Lissa, Italian fleet defeated by the Austrian *(1866)*, 265

Literature, in the nineteenth century, 719
Lithuanian provinces, Poland and, 663; persecution of the Jews in, 672
Liverpool, 465; gain in House of Commons by Redistribution Act of *1885*, 494; and the problem of transportation, 723, 725
Liverpool, Lord, and the Six Acts, 422
Livingstone, David, *1813-1873*, African explorations of, 552-553
Livonia, 645
Lombardo-Venetian Kingdom acquired by Austria at Congress of Vienna, 8, 23, 52-53; government of, 53-54; revolution in, 172, 388; reaction in, after *1848*, 215; agreement at Plombières concerning, 223; Austria loses *(1859-1866)*, 404
Lombardy, acquired by Austria at Congress of Vienna, 9; revolution in, 172; Austria recovers, 176; reaction in, after *1848*, 215; war in *(1859)*, 225; Sardinia receives, by the Peace of Villafranca, 226; illiteracy in *(1861)*, 381; Austria loses, 389
London, Conferences of the Powers in *(1830-1831)*, recognize the Kingdom of Belgium, 105; Conference *(1840)*, England, Russia, Austria, and Prussia make a treaty with Turkey, 132; Protocol *(1852)* concerning Schleswig-Holstein, 257-258; Conference *(1864)* unsuccessful, 258; gain of, by Redistribution Act of *1885*, 494; journals of, oppose Irish Home Rule, 504; Gladstonian vote in *(1886)*, 504; the Old Age Pensions Law in the County of, 516; Convention of *(1884)*, 540; Colonial Conferences in, 548; Treaty of *(1827)*, 609
London *Standard*, 419
London *Telegraph*, October 28, *1908*, interview with Emperor William II, 327
London *Times*, on cause of the Prussian victory at Königgrätz, 266; on the Dreyfus Case, 362
Lonsdale, Lord, 413
Lorraine, Germans invade, 296; large part of, ceded to Germany by Treaties of Versailles and Frankfort, 300; in the German Empire, 303; loss of, by France, 337
Loubet, Émile, President of the French Republic *(1899-1906)*, 361; pardons Dreyfus, 362; visits Victor Emmanuel III *(1904)*, 368
Louis Napoleon (King of Holland), 110, 127
Louis Napoleon Bonaparte (Napoleon III) (son of Louis Napoleon), 127-128; Boulogne fiasco, 129; favors the restoration of the Pope, 182; opportunity of, 198; his previous career, 199; elected a member of the Constituent Assembly, 199; a candidate for the presidency, 199; causes of his triumph, 200; elected president, December 10, *1848*, 200; combines with the Legislative Assembly to crush the Republicans, 201-202; demands the revision of the Constitution in order to prolong his Presidency, 203; Assembly votes against revision of the Constitution, 203; prepares for a coup d'état, 203; demands from Assembly the repeal of the Franchise Law of *1850*, 203; coup d'état of December *2, 1851*, 204; his proclamations, 204; appeals to the people, 205; proclaimed Emperor, December *2, 1852*, 205-206; character of, 206; his programme, 207; his powers, 208-209; his marriage, 210; his activities, 211; general prosperity under, 212; with England and Piedmont wages war against Russia in the Crimea, 212; Congress of Paris *(1856)*, 212; birth of an heir, 212; his policy of peace, 213; Cavour and, 220-227; his interest in Italy, 222; interview at Plombières, 222; commands his army in Italian campaign, 225; interview with the Emperor Francis Joseph I at Villafranca, 225; reasons for his action, 226; bargain with Cavour, 230; annexes Savoy and Nice, 231; resentment of England toward,

Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, *continued*
231, 274; approves of the invasion of the Papal States by the Piedmontese, 236; methods of, copied by Frederick William IV, of Prussia, 242-243; disastrous effect of the Italian war upon, 272; vacillation of, 273; makes secret treaty of commerce *(1860)* with England, 274; turns to the Liberals, 275; increases powers of Parliament, 275; and the Mexican Expedition, 277, 569; overthrows the Mexican Republic, 278; failure of the expedition, 279; effects of the failure upon, 280; grants concessions to liberalism, 280; attacks upon, 282; transformation of the Empire completed under, 283; unwise adherence to his doctrine of nationalities, 285; attitude toward Schleswig-Holstein affair *(1864)*, 286; meeting at Biarritz *(1865)*, 260, 286; fails to use his opportunity in *1866*, 287; failure of diplomacy of, 288; attitude toward the candidacy of Prince Leopold for the Spanish throne, 290; fails to secure alliances with the Powers, 294; surrenders to King William I of Prussia at Sedan *(1870)*, 297; growth of the Socialists under, 331-332; and the Third Republic, 341; conquests under, 373; attitude toward Russia *(1854)*, 613; and the Danubian Principalities *(1859)*, 618

Louis Philippe, Duke of Orleans, King of the French *(1830-1848)*, candidacy of, 96; made Lieutenant-General of France, 96; proclaimed King, 98; recognized by the Powers, 100; favors election of Leopold of Coburg as King of Belgium, 104; attitude toward the revolutionary movements *(1831)* in Italy, 110; reign of, 114-144; career of, 114; his liberalism, 114; his legal title to the throne, 115; and the revised Constitution, 116; the franchise lowered *(1831)*, 117; character of the July Monarchy, 117; insecurity of the régime, 118; the progressive and conservative parties under, 119; popular unrest, 120; Casimir-Périer Ministry, 120-121; and the Legitimists, 122; Republican insurrections *(1832)*, 123; vigorous measures of the government, 124; attempts upon the life of, 125; the September Laws *(1835)*, 125-126; and the Napoleonic legend, 127-129; personal government of, 131; ministry of Thiers, 131-132; ministry of Guizot, 133-142; industrial revolution, 137; growth of socialism under, 138-139; opposition to the policy of the Government, 139-142; overthrow of, 142-143; influence of his fall in Central Europe, 169; conquests of, 373

Louis I, King of Bavaria, aids Greeks, 608; son of, becomes King of Greece, *1833*, 611

Louis I, King of Portugal *(1861-1889)*, 577

Louis XV, King of France, loss of colonial empire under, 371

Louis XVI, King of France, 92, 114

Louis XVIII, King of France, *(1814-1824)*, restored to the French throne, 2; and the First Treaty of Paris *(1814)*, 3; and the Second Treaty of Paris *(1815)*, 13; and Alexander I, 16, 647; reign of, 66-83; and the Constitutional Charter *(1814)*, 67-70; character of, 70; difficulties of his situation, 71-75; the White Terror, 73; prorogues the Chamber, 74; checks the Ultras, 74; and the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle, 75; sends army into Spain *(1823)*, 82; death of, 82; character of his reign, 98

Louvel, assassin of Duke of Berry, 80

Lovett, Author of "*The Rotten House of Commons*," 447

Lowe, Robert, on the Reform Bill of *1867*, 464; in the Gladstone Ministry *(1868)*, 465

Lowell, A. L., on the franchise in England, 495-496; on the people of India, 522

Lübeck, member of the North German Confederation, 268; member of the German Empire, 304

Lucca, *52*
Lucerne, 584
Lucknow, *521*
Luxembourg Palace, Labor Commission meets at, 191
Luxemburg, member of the German Confederation, 31
Lyons, Republican insurrection in *(1834)*, 124; insurrection of workingmen in, 138
Lytton, Lord, Viceroy of India, *522*

Maassen, financial reformer of Prussia, 148
Macaulay, Thomas Babington, on the First Reform Bill, 434; on Gladstone, 466
Macaulay, Zachary, and the anti-slavery agitation, 440
Macedonia, and the Treaty of San Stefano, *1878*, 624; disposition of, by Congress of Berlin, *1878*, 625; question of, 627
Mackintosh, and the Penal Code, 424
MacMahon, Marshal, defeated in the battle of Wörth, *296*; chosen President of the French Republic, 342; establishment of the Septennate, 343; struggle with the Chamber, 348-349; his conception of the presidency, 349; resigns, 351; the Roman Catholic Church and the Republic under, 366
Madagascar, France sends expedition to, 353; French colony, 374
Madeira, part of the Kingdom of Portugal, 578
Madrid, riots in *(1820)*, 49; the Congress of Verona and the Madrid Government, 62-63; the Christinos control, *566*
Magenta, battle of, *225*, *725*
Mahratta Confederacy, Overthrow of, *520*
Magyars, position of, in Hungary, *24*, 154, 176; succeed in making Magyar the official language in Hungary *(1844)*, 157; the Croatians rise against, 177-178; Francis Joseph I and, 388; Ausgleich satisfactory to, 394; oppose the demands of the Czechs, 398; and the policy of Magyarization, 403; Francis Kossuth, leader of a party of, 404; oppose the "occupation" of Bosnia and Herzegovina, 405
Mahdi, leader of revolt in the Soudan, 561-562
Mahmud II, Sultan, refuses the armistice of the Treaty of London *(1827)*, 609-610; war with Russia *(1828)*, 610; signs Treaty of Adrianople *(1829)*, 611
Majuba Hill *(1881)*, 539
Malta, retained by England in *1815*, 9, 519
Manchester, unrepresented in Parliament *(1815)*, 414, 434-435; Anti-Corn-Law League founded at, *1839*, *452*; and the problem of transportation, 723, 725
Manchuria, invaded by the Japanese, 695; Russian entrance into, 697; Russian activity in, 699; Russo-Japanese War in, 701-702; disposition of, by Treaty of Portsmouth *(1905)*, 703
Manifesto of August 19, *1905* (Russia), 710-711
Manifesto of October 30, *1905* (Russia), 712
Manin, Daniel, Republican leader in Venice, 173; on Italy, *221*
Manitoba, admitted into the Dominion of Canada, *1870*, *529*
Manuel, elected to the French Chamber of Deputies, 78
Manuel II, King of Portugal, *1908*—, 578
March Days *(1848)*, Hungary, 170, 174
March Laws (Hungary), *1848*, 170-171, 177, 179
Marches, The, 235; annexed to Piedmont *(1860)*, 236
Maria Christina, Queen Regent of Spain, 574
Maria da Gloria (Maria II), Queen of Portugal, *1826-1828*, *1834-1853*; Civil War with Dom Miguel, 577; death of, 577
Marie, Minister of Commerce, 192
Marie Louise, wife of Napoleon I, receives Parma, 9; forced to flee from Parma, 110
Maritime Province, acquired by Russia from China *(1860)*, 682, 687
Maritza, 621

Marmont, Commander of the troops in Paris *(1830)*, 95
Marrast, in the Provisional Government, 188
Marseilles, uprisings in, 73, 123
Mars-la-Tours, Germans defeat French at, *296*
Martignac Ministry, 89
Martinique, French possession, *1815*, 371
Marx, Karl, and Socialism in Germany, 312
Massa, *223*
Massawa, seized by Italy *(1885)*, 382
Mauritius, Slavery in, abolished by England, 439-440; English possession *(1815)*, 519
Maximilian, Archduke of Austria, offered the imperial crown of Mexico, *278*; disastrous outcome of the adventure, *279*; death of, 280
May Laws (Prussia, *1873*, *1874*, *1875)*, 308
Mazzini, Joseph *(1805-1872)*, 160-164; early life, 160; his intense patriotism, 161; founder of "Young Italy," 161; methods and aims of the society, 162-163; and Pius IX concerning Italy, 167; one of the Triumvirs of Rome, 181; compared with Cavour, *217*, *219*; on education, 381
Mecklenburg, Government of, 36; and the Zollverein, 149
Mecklenburg-Schwerin, in the North German Confederation, 269
Mehemet Ali, Viceroy of Egypt, war with Turkey, 131; founds a semi-royal house, 557-558, 602; Sultan asks aid of, against the Greeks, 607
Melbourne, Lord, in the Grey Ministry *(1831)*, 430; and the political education of Queen Victoria, 445; fall of ministry of *(1841)*, 451
Melikoff, Loris, 669
Méline, Prime Minister, and the Dreyfus Case, 360
Menelek, ruler of Abyssinia, 383
Metternich, at Congress of Vienna, 4; and the Austrian policy, 9; and the Holy Alliance, 15; and the Quadruple Alliance, 18;
Metternich, *continued*
characterization and historical importance of, 20-23; and Francis I, *25*; his system and its application in other countries, 27-28, 35, 37-38, 58-64; and the German universities and the press, 39-42; conferences at Carlsbad, 41-44; doctrine of the right of intervention, 58-59; and the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle, 59; his principle of intervention accepted, 59; triumph of his system, 63; his system checked, 65; opinion of the Polignac Ministry of Charles X, 90; and Charles X, *92*; and the July Revolution *(1830)*, 100; on Italy, 110; intervention of, in the Papal States, 111; supreme in Germany, 113; estimate of the July Monarchy, 118-119, 145; control of, in Austria *(1815-1848)*, 152; and Pius IX, 166; overthrow of, 170; opinion of Cavour, *221*; and the Greek War of Independence, 608; Alexander I and, 649
Metz, 296; fall of, 298
Mexico, 48; expedition into, 277-279, 569
Michel, General, 295
Miguel, Dom, King of Portugal, *(1828-1834)*, younger son of John VI, King of Portugal, 576; proclaimed King, *1828*, 577; Civil War with Maria da Gloria, 577; renounces claims to throne *(1834)*, 577
Mikado of Japan, 688; and the Shogunate, 691-692; recovers power, 692
Milan, insurrection in, 172; occupied by the French and Sardinians *(1859)*, *225*; riots in *(1889)*, 383; riots in *(1898)*, 383
Milan, King of Servia, forced to abdicate, *1889*, 633
Militarism, spread of, 728; expense of, 728-729
Mill, John Stuart, speech in favor of suffrage for women, 464
Milner, Sir Alfred, Reports on South Africa, *1899*, 542-543; on the rapid growth of the Egyptian debt, 558
Milyoukov, 678
Mines, Labor in, Act *(1842)*, 455

Miquelon, French possession, *1815*, 371
Mir, government of, 646; cultivation of land in, 655; land problem in, 658; transformation of, *1969*, 717
Missolonghi, siege of *(1825-1826)*, and fall of, 607-608
Modena, Austrian restoration in, 9, 52-53; ruler of, forced to flee, 110; restoration of the Duke of, 226; annexed to Piedmont *(1860)*, 230
Mohammed V, Sultan of Turkey, *1909*—, 643
Moldavia, *1815*, part of the Ottoman Empire, 601; part of Bessarabia ceded to, by Treaty of Paris *(1856)*, 615. *See* Danubian Principalities
Molé, minister of Louis Philippe, 131, 133
Molesworth, on qualifications for suffrage in boroughs, 414 *note*
Moltke, Hellmuth von, Prussian General, 264; plans for the invasion of Bohemia in the war against Austria *(1866)*, 265; superiority of the armies under, 266
Mommsen, 246
Monaco, 52
Moniteur, The, 92
Monroe Doctrine, 64-65
Montalembert, 199
Montenegro, Slavs of, aid Herzegovina, *1875*, 620; and Servia declare war against Turkey, *1876*, 622-623; complete independence of, recognized by the Treaty of San Stefano, *1878*, 624; declared independent by Congress of Berlin, *1878*, 625-626; Servia and, 641
Montijo, Mlle. Eugénie de, marries Napoleon III, 210. *See* Empress Eugénie
Moral and Civil Primacy of the Italians," " The, by Gioberti, 164
Moravia, 23; position in the Empire *(1861)*, 390
Morea, 605; conquered, 607; French army in, 611
Morley, Lord, on the labor code, 456; on the secret ballot, 483-484; on Irish Home Rule, 501, 508; on relations of England and the Transvaal, 540
Morocco, 551, 601
Moscow, population of, 675; students at the University of, 678; students in, revolt, 709; riots in, 712
Mukden, 701; captured by the Japanese, 702
Munich, Döllinger and the University of, 307
Municipal Corporations Act *(1835)*, England, 444
Murad V, 621
Murat, King of Naples, 5, 51
Music, in the nineteenth century, 720
Mutsuhito, Emperor of Japan, *1867*—, accession of, 692; grants a constitution *(1889)*, 694

Nanking, Treaty of *(1842)*, 685
Naples, Kingdom of (Kingdom of the Two Sicilies), Murat, King of *(1814)*, 5, 51; the Congress of Vienna and, 52; Ferdinand I, King of, makes a treaty with Austria, 53; government of, 55-56; the Carbonari, 56; Revolution of *1820* in, 57; constitution granted, 57; and the Congress of Troppau *(1820)*, 59; and the Congress of Laibach *(1821)*, 60; Austria invades and restores absolutism in, 60-61; revolution in *(1848)*, 167; coöperates in insurrection against Austria, 173; recalls troops, 175-176; absolutism restored in, 181; reaction in, after *1848*, 215; agreement at Plombières concerning, 223; conquest of, 232-237; Cavour's policy concerning, 234; Sicily invaded by Garibaldi *(1860)*, 234; conquered, 235; flight of King Francis II, 235; annexed to Piedmont *(1860)*, 236-237; government of *(1815-1860)*, 377; illiteracy in *(1861)*, 381
Napoleon, Prince Jerome, betrothed to Princess Clotilde, 223
Napoleon I, Overthrow of, 1; escapes from Elba and seizes the government of France, 13; the concert of Powers and, 17; on Italian unity, 50; significance of his activity in Italy, 51; the second funeral of, 128; the *"Napoleonic Ideas"* by Na-

Napoleon I, *continued*
poleon III, 206; and the Concordat of *1801*, 367; and Waterloo, 418; and Switzerland, 585; Alexander I of Russia and, 646; flight of, from Russia, 722
Napoleon III. *See* Louis Napoleon Bonaparte
"*Napoleonic Ideas*," by Napoleon III, 206
Nassau, 40; supports Austria in the war of *1866*, 263; incorporated in the Kingdom of Prussia, 267
Natal, responsible government granted to *(1893)*, 528; Boers migrate into, 537; made a colony of England *(1843)*, 538; position of, in the Union of South Africa *(1909)*, 544-545
National, The, 143
National Constituent Assembly *(1848)*, France, 193
National Defense (France, *1870)*, Government of, 298-300
National Workshops (France), 191-193; abolished, 194
Navarino, battle of, *1827*, 610
Navigation, steam, 723-724
Navigation Laws (England), 450; Huskisson's reforms of, *1823-1825*, 451; abolished *(1849)*, 454-455
Nemours, Duke of, son of Louis Philippe, 131
Netherlands, The. *See* Holland and Belgium
New Brunswick, English possession *(1815)*, 519, 523; responsible government granted to *(1848)*, 527; becomes a member of the Dominion of Canada *(1867)*, 528
New Caledonia, 336
Newcastle, 724
Newcomen, steam-engine made by *(1705)*, 407
Newfoundland, 371; English possession *(1815)*, 519, 523; responsible government granted to, 527; and the Dominion of Canada, 529
New Guinea, part of, owned by Germany, 319
New Holland, 531
New South Wales, responsible government granted to, 527; Captain Cook's voyage to, 531; in the Australian Commonwealth, 532; New Zealand separated from *(1865)*, 534
New South Wales, *continued*
New York *Herald*, and the Stanley expedition, 553
New Zealand, Tasman's discovery of, 531; annexed to the British Empire, *1839*, 534; given responsible government, *1854*, 527, 534; made a separate colony, *1865*, 534; becomes Dominion of, *(1907)*, 534; advanced social legislation, 535; system of taxation, 535; industrial legislation, 535; Old Age Pension Law *(1898* and *1905)*, 536; woman suffrage in, 536; autonomy in, 546, 549
Nice, 223; annexed to France, 231
Nicholas I, Tsar of Russia, *1825-1855*, 108; aids Francis Joseph I of Austria against Hungary, 180, 654; intervenes in the Greek War of Independence, 609; ambitions of, 611-612; attitude of Napoleon III toward, 613; reign of, 650-655; accession and training, 650; system of repression by police and censorship, 651-652; literature under, 652-653; abolishes capital punishment except for treason, 653; on serfdom, 653; foreign policy of, 653-654; the Crimean War *(1854-1855)*, and the humiliation of Russia, 654; death of, 615, 655
Nicholas II, Tsar of Russia, *1894*—, accession and policy of repression, 676; increasing disaffection under, 677; condition of the peasantry, 677; persecution of the "intellectuals," 678; and Finland, 678-680; abrogates the Finnish constitution, 679; on the possession of the Liao-tung peninsula by the Japanese, 696; enters upon a more liberal policy, 708; demands of the liberals not granted by, 709; issues the Manifesto of August 19, *1905*, 710; and the Manifesto of October 30, *1905*, 712; and a decree constituting the Council of the Empire, 713; the "organic laws" issued in the name of, 713; and the First Duma,

Nicholas II, *continued*
713-715; and the Second Duma, 715-716; alters the electoral system, 716; and the Third Duma, 716; and the transformation of the mir, 717; restores the liberties of Finland, 717-718; on the limitation of armaments *(1898)*, 729; and the First Peace Conference at the Hague *(1899)*, 730-733; and the Second Peace Conference at the Hague *(1907)*, 734
Niebuhr, on the Papal States, 55
Nihilism, Rise of, 666; Stepniak and Turgenieff on, 666; persecution of the Nihilists, 667; becomes socialistic, 667; propaganda of, 667; policy of terrorism, 668-669
Nikolsburg, Preliminary Peace of, 263, 267
Nile, sources of, discovered, 552
Ningpo, opened to British trade by Treaty of Nanking *(1842)*, 685
Nippon, 688
Nogi, General, conducts the siege of Port Arthur, 701
Nomination boroughs (England, *1815)*, 413
Normandy, German troops withdrawn from, 338
North America, English possessions in *(1815)*, 519; British, 523-530
North German Confederation, composition of, 268; government of *(1867)*, 269, 303; alliance with the South German States, 270-271
North German Lloyd steamship line, established *(1857)*, 724
Norway, joined with Sweden, 10, 592; Constitution of Eidsvold *(1814)*, 595, 598; war with Sweden, 595-596; Union with Sweden, 596; rulers *(1815-1905)*, 596-597; constitution of *1866*, 597; friction with Sweden, 597-598; abolition of the Norwegian nobility, 599; dissolution of the Union with Sweden and Treaty of Carlstad *(1905)*, 599-600; chooses Prince Charles of Denmark, who becomes Haakon VII *(1905)*, 600; suffrage in, 600
Novara, battle of *(1849)*, 62, 181, 215
Nova Scotia, English possession *(1815)*, 519, 523; responsible government granted to *(1848)*, 527; becomes a member of the Dominion of Canada *(1867)*, 528
Nyassa, Lake, 552

Obrenovitch, Milosch, becomes "Hereditary Prince of the Servians" *(1830)*, 604; House of, 633
Obstruction, adoption of the policy of, by Irish Home Rulers, 498
O'Connell, Daniel, founds the Catholic Association in Ireland, 427; elected to Parliament, 427; and the Irish party, 469, 498
O'Connor, Feargus, and the Chartist movement, 448
Okhotsk, 681
Oku, General, at Mukden, 701
Old Age, Insurance Law *(1889)*, Germany, 316; Pensions Act *(1908)*, Great Britain, 515-516; Pension Law, New Zealand *(1898* and *1905)*, 536; Denmark *(1891)*, 594
Old Catholics, 307-308
Old Sarum, 413, 432
Ollivier, leader of the Third Party, 282; becomes head of the ministry, 283; and the Hohenzollern candidacy, 291, 293
Olmütz, flight of the Emperor to, 178, 248, 388; Bismarck on the Convention of, 252-253
Omdurman, battle of, *1898*, 562
Ontario, 527, 528, and *see* Canada
Opium War, *1840-1842*, 685
Orange Free State, founded by Boers from Cape Colony, 538; annexed to the British Empire *(1848)*, 538; England renounces sovereignty over *(1852)*, 538; and the South African War, *1899-1902*, 543-544; annexed to the British Empire *(1902)*, 544; responsible government granted to *(1907)*, 528, 544; position in the Union of South Africa, 544-545
Ordinances of July *(1830)*, 92-93; withdrawn, 96
Oregon, settlement of the Oregon dispute, *1846*, 529

"Organic Laws," The (Russia), 713
Orleans, Duchess of, 143
Orleans, Duke of, 91. *See also* Louis Philippe
Orsini, conspiracy of, *222*
Oscar I, King of Norway and Sweden, *1844-1859*, 597
Oscar II, King of Norway and Sweden, *1872-1905*; King of Sweden alone, *1905-1907*; friction between Norway and Sweden, 597-598; question of the consular service *(1892)*, 599; dissolution of the union of Sweden and Norway and Treaty of Carlstad, 599-600; death of *(1907)*, 600
Osman Pasha, fortifies Plevna, 623; surrenders, 624
Ottawa, federal parliament at, 528
Otto I, King of Greece, *1833-1862*, 611; reign of, 633; becomes a constitutional monarch, *1844*, 634; overthrow of, *1862*, 634
Ottoman Empire, The Disruption of, and the Rise of the Balkan States, 601-644. *See* Turkey
Oudh, Annexation of, to the British Empire, 520
Owen, Robert, and the child labor agitation, 442
Oxford University, Religious tests in, 415; Gladstone at, 465-466; religious tests in, abolished, 483, 485

Pact of *1815* (Switzerland), 584
Palacky, historian, 154
Palmerston, Lord, attitude toward Italian unity, *229*; estimate of Cavour, *239*; in the Grey Ministry, 430; attitude toward the extension of the suffrage, 461; death of, 461; on the secret ballot, 483; attitude toward the Crimean War, 613
Papal Guarantees, Law of, 378
Papal Infallibility, Dogma of, 307
Papal States, restoration of, by Congress of Vienna, 9-10, *52*; government of, *55*; insurrection in *(1831)*, 110; Austrian intervention, 111; French seize Ancona, 111; absolutism restored, 111; results of the insurrections, 111-112; coöperate in insurrection against Austria *(1848-1849)*, 173; recall troops, 175; agreement at Plombières concerning, *223*. *See* Rome
Paris, First Treaty of *(1814)*, 3, *5*; the "Hundred Days" in, 13; Second Treaty of *(1815)*, 13; oppositon of the liberal editors of *(1830)*, 94; July Revolution *(1830)* in, 95, 117; Louis Philippe in, 114, 125; Republican insurrection in *(1832)*, 123; revolution of February *(1848)*, 141-142; proclamation of the Second Republic in, 144; political life in *(1848)*, 190; and the National Workshops, 192-193; the June Days *(1848)*, in, 194; declared under martial law, *202*; Louis Napoleon's coup d'état of December *2*, *1851*, in, 203-204; the "massacre of the boulevards," *205*; international exposition in *(1855)*, 211-212; improvements in, *212*; Congress of *(1856)*, *212*, *220*; excitement in, over the news of the candidacy of Prince Leopold, 291; war party in *(1870)*, 293; proclamation of the Third Republic *(1870)*, *297*; siege of, 298-299; capitulation of, 299; and the Commune, 330-336; and the Assembly, 330; distress of the working classes in, 331; revolutionary elements in, 331-332; action of the National Guard in, 332; war between the Commune and the Versailles Government, 333; government of the Commune, 333; the Commune and National Assembly clash, 334; second siege of, 334-335; Government's punishment of, 335; seat of government transferred to *(1880)*, 352; and the Boulanger crisis, 356; Exposition of *1889* in, 357; Treaty of, *1898*, Spain and the United States, 574; Treaty of *(1856)*, 615-616; Conference of *(1858)*, 618
Paris, Count of, grandson of Louis Philippe, 143; Orleanist Pretender, 341-342
Parish Councils Bill of *1894* (England), 509

Parliaments, Modern, Australia, Senate and House of Representatives *(1901)*, 534; Austria, House of Lords and House of Representatives *(1867)*, 395; Hungary, Table of Magnates and Table of Deputies *(1848)*, 395; Austria-Hungary, The Delegations *(1867)*, 394; Belgium, Two Chambers *(1831)*, 581; Bulgaria, Sobranje *(1879)*, 628; Canada, Dominion of, Senate and House of Commons *(1867)*, 529; Crete, Assembly *(1907)*, 635 *note;* Denmark, Landsthing and Folkething *(1866)*, 594; Finland, Single Chamber (200), Grand Committee (60), *1906*, 718; France, Senate and Chamber of Deputies *(1875)*, 345-346; Germany, Bundesrath and Reichstag *(1871)*, 304; Great Britain, House of Lords and House of Commons, 410, 437-438, 493-496 *(1885)*; Greece, Boulé *(1864)*, 634; Holland, States General, Upper and Lower Houses *(1848)*, 580; Iceland *(1874)*, 595; Italy, Senate and Chamber of Deputies *(1861)*, 377-378; Japan, House of Peers and House of Representatives *(1889)*, 694; New Zealand, 534; Norway, Storthing *(1814)*, 595; Portugal, 577-578; Prussia, House of Peers and House of Representatives *(1850)*, 186; Roumania, Two Chambers *(1881)*, 632; Russia, Council of the Empire and Duma *(1906)*, 713; Spain, Senate and Congress of Deputies *(1876)*, 573; Sweden, Upper and Lower Houses *(1866)*, 597, 600; Switzerland, Council of States and National Council *(1848)*, 586; Turkey, Senate and Chamber of Deputies *(1908)*, 642; Union of South Africa, Senate and House of Assembly *(1909)*, 544-545

Parma, Duchy of, disposition of, by Congress of Vienna, 9, 52-53; Marie Louise, Duchess of, forced to flee from, 110, 226; annexed to Piedmont *(1860)*, 230

Parnell, Charles Stuart, leader of the Home Rulers, 498

Patrimony of St. Peter, 238

Peace Conferences at the Hague, First *(1899)*, 730-733, establishes Permanent Court of Arbitration, 733; Second *(1907)*, 734-735; significance of, 735

Pedro I of Brazil, becomes Pedro IV of Portugal, 576; abdicates in favor of his daughter, Maria da Gloria, 576-577

Pedro V, King of Portugal, *1853-1861*, 577

Peel, Sir Robert, reforms Penal Code *(1823)*, 424; and the Catholic Emancipation Act, 427-428; on the Reform Bill, 434-435; on Queen Victoria, 445; leader of the Conservatives, becomes Prime Minister *(1841-1846)*, 451-452; reforms the tariff *(1842)*, 452; repeal of the Corn Laws *(1846)*, 454; overthrow of, 454; and Gladstone, 466

Peking, 684; threatened *(1858)*, 686-687; legations in *(1900)*, rescued by the Powers, 698; Empress-Dowager returns to, 704

Penal Code, reformed *(1823)* by Sir Robert Peel, 424

Perry, Commodore, sent by United States to Japan, 690, 693; the Shogun makes a treaty with *(1854)*, 691

Pescadores Islands, China cedes, to Japan, 696

Peschiera, 173

Peter I, King of Servia, *1903—*, 633

Peterloo, Massacre of, *1819*, 421

Philhellenic Societies, founded in France, Germany, Switzerland, England, and the United States, 607

Philippines, 565; Spain loses, 574

Pi y Margall, 572

Picquart, Colonel, and the Dreyfus Case, 359-363; promoted Brigadier-General, 363; becomes Minister of War, 363

Piedmont or Kingdom of Sardinia, acquires Genoa, 3, 5, 52; Victor Emmanuel I and his government, 54-55; revolution in, and abdication of Victor Emmanuel I, 61-62; reforms of Charles Albert in, 167; sends an

Piedmont, *continued*
army to aid insurrection in Lombardy, 173; Charles Albert defeated at Custozza *(1848)*, 176; abdication of Charles Albert, 181-183; Constitutional Statute *(1848)*, 185; accession of Victor Emmanuel II, 181, 215-216; a constitutional state, 216; takes the lead in the making of the Kingdom of Italy, 216; Cavour in, 216-239; economic development of, 218; Crimean policy of, 212, 219, 613; Cavour at the Congress of Paris *(1856)*, denounces the policy of Austria in Italy, 220; army strengthened in, 221; founding of the National Society, 221; allied with France in war against Austria, 225; campaign of *1859*, 225; Peace of Villafranca, 225-226; Lombardy annexed to, 228, 389; Modena, Parma, Tuscany, and the Romagna annexed to, 230; army of, defeats the Papal troops at Castelfidardo, 236; Naples, Sicily, Umbria, and the Marches annexed to, 236; Kingdom of, gives way to the Kingdom of Italy, 237; constitutional government in, 377; constitution of, adopted with slight variations as the constitution of Italy *(1861)*, 377-378; illiteracy in *(1861)*, 381; signs Treaty of Paris, *(1856)*, 615-616

Pitt, William, Earl of Chatham, 432

Pitt, William, the Younger, on representation in Parliament, 415; and Catholic Emancipation, 426

Pius IX, Pope, *1846-1878*, reforms of, 166; flees from Rome, 181; restored by the French, 182; his government, 215, 220; to be president of the projected Italian Confederation, 226; issues major excommunication, 230; refuses to recognize the Kingdom of Italy, 237; loses temporal power by the Italian occupation of Rome, 301; and the Kulturkampf, 306-309; attitude toward the Law of Papal Guarantees, 378-379; death of, 309, 380

Pius X, Pope, *1903—*, protests against visit of President Loubet of France to Victor Emmanuel III *(1904)*, 368; condemns Law of *1905* in France, 369-370; attitude toward the Law of Papal Guarantees, 379

Plébiscite, in France, December 20, *1851*, 205; November 21, *1852*, 205-206; May 8, *1870*, 284; in Italy, March, *1860*, 230, 231, 236

Plehve, Minister of the Interior (Russia), *1902-1904*, repressive régime of, 707; assassination of, 707

Plevna, Siege of, 623-624, 625, 632

Plombières, Interview at, between Cavour and Napoleon III, 222-223, 260

Plural Voting, Double Vote in France by Electoral Law *(1820)*, 81, rescinded *(1831)*, 117; in England, 495, 517; in Belgium, 582

Pobyedonostseff, influence of, in Russia, 670-671; on parliamentary institutions and the press, 671; in the reign of Nicholas II, 676; removal of, 712

Poland, granted a constitution, 38; influence of the July Revolution *(1830)* in, 100, 108; revolution in, 105, 106-110; restoration of the Kingdom of, in *1815*, 106, 647; Alexander I grants a constitution to, 107, 648; friction between the Poles and the Russians, 107, 649-650; failure of the insurrection *(1830-1831)*, 109, 653; becomes a province of the Russian Empire, 109; influence of events in Italy *(1859-1860)* upon, 246; Russia and *(1815)*, 645; insurrection *(1863)* in, 662-664; Russification of, 664-665; persecution of the Jews in, 672

Polignac Ministry, 90-91

Polish-Saxon question at the Congress of Vienna, 7-8

Pomerania, acquired by Prussia, 8

Pondicherry, French possession, *1815*, 371

Port Arthur, seized by Japan, 695; China cedes, to Japan, 696; Japan relinquishes, 696; Russia secures a lease of

Port Arthur, *continued*
(1898), 697, 699; Japan and the Russian fleet at, 701; siege of, 701; Japan destroys the fleet at, 702; surrenders, 702, 709; Russia transfers to Japan her lease of, 703
Porte. *See* Turkey
Porto Rico, 565, 572, 574
Portsmouth (England), local government in, *1832*, 443
Portsmouth, N. H., Treaty of *(1905)*, 702-703
Portugal, 57; English intervention in, 423; stations of, in Africa, *1815*, 551; acquisitions in Africa, *1884-1890*, 554; and the Congress of Berlin, *1884-1885*, 555; flight of the royal family to Brazil, *1807*, 575; revolution of *1820*, 576; constitution of *1822* accepted by King John VI, 576; loss of Brazil, 576; civil war between Queen Maria da Gloria and Dom Miguel, 577; death of Maria, 577; recent events in, 577; assassination of Carlos I and the Crown Prince, *1908*, 577; accession of Manuel II, 578; colonial possessions of, 578; establishes trade centers at the five treaty ports of China, 686
Portugal, Crown Prince of, assassinated, *1908*, 577
Posen, retained by Prussia, 8; Archbishop of, asks Bismarck's aid in behalf of the Papacy, 306-307
Postal Savings Banks, in England, 459; in New Zealand, 535
Postal Union, International, 591
Pragmatic Sanction (Spain), 565-566
Prague, Siege of *(1848)*, 175; Peace of *(1866)*, 263, 267; Francis Joseph I agrees to be crowned at, 398; University of, divided, 400; declared in a state of siege *(1893)*, 401
Preferential tariffs (England and her colonies), 548
Presburg, Diet of, 155, removed to Budapest, 171
Press, in Belgium, freedom of, granted by the Constitution *(1831)*, 582; in England, Gag Laws *(1819)*, 422; in France, freedom of, established by
Press, *continued*
Louis XVIII, 69; Law of *1819*, 78, rescinded, 81; attempt to destroy the freedom of the, 88; liberty of the, suspended by the July Ordinances *(1830)*, 92; the July Monarchy and, 124-125; September Law of *1835* concerning, 126-127; under the Second French Republic, 190, 202; under the Second Empire, 209-210; law of *1868* concerning, 281; practically unlimited freedom of, secured *(1881)*, 352; and the Franco-German War, 289, 291-292; in Germany, censorship of, after the Conference of Carlsbad, 42; and Socialism, 314; under Emperor William II. 325; in Japan, 694; in Prussia, under Frederick William IV, 150, 242; and the Franco-German War, 289, 291-292; in Russia, censorship of, under Nicholas I, 651-652; Pobyedonostseff on, 671; freedom of, during the war with Japan, 708; in Spain, *1815*, 47
Pretoria, 545
Pretoria Convention, *1881*, 540; Morley on, 540
Prim. General, leader of the revolt in Spain, *1865*, 569
Prince Consort (Albert of Saxe-Coburg), 445
Prince Edward Island, English possession, 519, 523; responsible government granted to, *1851*, 527; admitted into the Dominion of Canada, *1873*, 529
Prince Imperial, son of Napoleon III, 212; and the Bonapartists, 341
Prince Regent, later George IV, 420
Progress, Certain Features of Modern, 719-736
Proportional representation, in Switzerland, 590
Protected Princes of India, 522
Protection, Policy of, Germany adopts *(1879)*, 310-312; influence of, on colonial policy, 318-319; England and, 450-455; in the British Colonies, 548; Alexander II of Russia adopts, 674
Provisional Government (France), 143; composition of, 188; achievements of, 189-193

Prussia, demands of, at Congress of Vienna, 6-7; acquisitions of, at Congress of Vienna, 8; and the Holy Alliance, 14-16; signs Quadruple Alliance *(1815)*, 17; position in the Diet, 30; national disappointment after *1815*, 32-44; promise of a constitution, 35; Metternich's influence in, 35; King Frederick William III becomes reactionary, 38; Wartburg Festival, 39-40; Carlsbad Decrees, 41-44; surrenders to the leadership of Austria, 44; at Congress of Troppau *(1820)*, 59; at Congress of Verona *(1822)*, 62; recognizes the Kingdom of Belgium, 105; and the revolution in Poland, 106-110; and the revolution in Germany *(1830)*, 112; and Turkish affairs, 132; London Conference *(1840)*, 132; *1830-1848*, 145-152; evolution of, 146-152; revision of the system of taxation, 147; the Zollverein, 148-149; death of Frederick William III, and accession of Frederick William IV, 149; the Letter Patent of February, *1847*, promises a national assembly, 151; conflict between Frederick William IV and the United Landtag, 152; events in Berlin, March, *1848*, 173; Frederick William IV promises a representative constituent assembly, 174; leadership in Germany offered to the King of, 184-185; rejects the work of the Frankfort Parliament, 185; the "humiliation of Olmütz," 185; constitution of *1850*, 185-186, 306; contemplates intervention in Austro-Sardinian War, 226-227; reaction in, *1850-1858*, 240; a constitutional but not a parliamentary state, 241; control of the press, 242; the privileged class, 243; economic transformation, 243-244; industrial development, 244-245; rise of a wealthy middle class, 245; intellectual foundations for the hegemony of, 245-246; the army in, 248; army reform *(1860)* under William I and von Roon, 249; opposition of the Chamber to army reform, 249; Bismarck

Prussia, *continued*
appointed president of the ministry, 249-250; struggle between the Upper and the Lower Houses over the budget, 255; Bismarck's policy of "blood and iron" for, 255; the three wars of, 256; Bismarck's plans regarding Schleswig-Holstein, 257; declares war on Denmark, 258; secures Schleswig-Holstein and Lauenburg jointly with Austria by the Treaty of Vienna, 259, 593; Convention of Gastein, 259-260; buys Lauenburg, 260; alliance with Italy, 261; troops of, enter Holstein, 263; withdraws from the Confederation, 263; war with Austria and her allies *(1866)*, 263; General von Moltke conquers North Germany, 264; defeats Austria at Königgrätz, 265; terms of peace with Austria, 267; annexations of, 267; and the North German Confederation, 268-270; alliance with South German states, 270; position of, in *1866*, 287-288; France declares war against *(1870)*, 293; South German states join, 293-294; invasion of France, 296; victories over the French at Wörth, Forbach, Spicheren, Borny, Mars-la-Tours, and Gravelotte, 296; surrender of the Emperor Napoleon III at Sedan, 297; siege of Paris, 298-299; capitulation of Metz, 298; capitulation of Paris and armistice, 299; Treaties of Versailles and Frankfort with France, 300; unification of Germany completed, William I becomes German Emperor, 301; position of, in the German Empire, 303-304; Protestantism in, 306; Kulturkampf, 306-310; the Falk Laws, 308; conflict of Church and State, 308-309; Falk Laws suspended *(1879)*, rescinded *(1886)*, religious orders, except Jesuits, permitted to return *(1887)*, 309; death of William I, *1888*, 322; accession and death of Frederick III, 322; accession of William II, 322; demand for electoral reform in, 326; demand

Prussia, *continued*
for parliamentary reform, 326; military system of, adopted by other countries, 481; signs Treaty of Paris *(1856)*, 615-616; establishes trade centers at the five treaty ports of China, 686
Puebla, defeat of the French troops at, 278, 280
Puffing Billy, The, 724
Punjab, annexation of, by England, 520
Pushkin, 652

Quadrilateral, The, 173, 226
Quadruple Alliance *(1815)*, signed by the Powers, 16-17, 59
Quebec, 523, 527, 528. *See* Canada
Queen's University, 484, 516
Queensland, responsible government granted to, *1859*, 527; in the Australian Commonwealth, 532

Radetzky, Austrian commander in Italy, 173, 175
Railroads, in the Australian Commonwealth, 533; in Belgium, 582; in Bulgaria, 631; in Canada (Canadian Pacific), 530; in China, 704; in France, extension of, under the Second Empire, 211; in Germany, 245, 305; in Greece, 635; in Hungary, government ownership of, 403; in Italy, 385; in Japan, 693; in New Zealand, government ownership of, 535; in Roumania, 632; in Russia, Trans-Siberian, 675, 696, 697, 699, 701; Trans-Caspian, 682; invention of, 724-725; Hadley, A. T., on the importance of, in war, 725-726
Rambouillet, 94
Rand, gold discovered in the, 541
Ravenna, 233
Reaction, in Austria and Germany, 23-44; and Revolution in Spain and Italy, 45-65
"Recent Events in Romagna" (1846), by D'Azeglio, 165
Reconstruction of Europe, 1-22
Red Cross Society, 591; Russian officials and, 709
Red Sea, Italy seizes positions on *(1885)*, 382; route to India, 488
Redistribution Act (England), *1885*, 493-494
Referendum, adopted in New Zealand, 536; in Switzerland, 588-590
Reform Bills (England), *1832*, 436-438, 483, 492, 511; *1867*, 463, 492; *1884*, 492-493; *1885*, Redistribution Act, 493-494
Reform, The, 143
Reichenau, Louis Philippe in, 114
Reichsrath or Parliament of Austria, 395
Reichstadt, Duke of, son of Napoleon Bonaparte, 111, 127, *also known as* King of Rome *and as* Napoleon II
Reichstag, 269, 303-304; *1877*, Center the largest party in, 309; Socialist party in *(1890)*, 314-315; Socialist party loses in *(1907)*, 324-325
Reid, Stuart J., Lord Durham's biographer, 526 and *note*
Reign of Louis Philippe, 114-144
Rennes, Court of Cassation orders a retrial of Dreyfus at, 362; verdict of court-martial of, quashed, 363
Restoration, France during the, 66-99
Réunion (formerly Bourbon), Island of, French possession, *1815*, 371
Revolutions of *1820-1821*, in Spain, 49-50, 62-63; in Naples, 57; in Piedmont, 61-62; reasons for the failure of the movements of *1820*, 62
Revolutions of *1830*, in France, 95-96; influence of, 100, 429; in Belgium, 103-104; in Poland, 108-109; in Italy, 110-112; in Germany, 112
Revolutions of *1848*, in France, 141-144, 187; influence of, 145; in Hungary, 169-171; in Bohemia, 171-172; in Lombardy-Venetia, 172-173; in Germany, 173-174; the March revolutions everywhere triumphant, 174; results of, 185-186
Rhodes, Cecil, and the Jameson Raid, 542
Rhodesia, 542, 545
Richardson, murder of, in Japan *(1862)*, 691

Richelieu, Duke of, Minister of Louis XVIII, 75; reorganizes the army, 76; and the electoral system, 77; and the press, 78
Riego, proclaims Constitution of *1812*, 49
Rio de Oro, 574
Rio Muni, 574
Risorgimento, Il, founded by Cavour, 217
Risorgimento, The, 166; *and see* 215-239
Rivet Law (France), 337
Roberts, Lord, in the South African War, 543-544
Rocket, The, 725
Rodjestvensky, Admiral, Russian fleet under, destroyed by Admiral Togo, May *(1905)*, 702
Romagna, Revolutionary movements in *(1831)*, 110; *"Recent Events in Romagna,"* by D'Azeglio, 165; agreement at Plombières concerning, 223; desires annexation to Piedmont, 226; annexed to Piedmont *(1860)*, 230
Roman Catholic Church. *See* Catholic Church (Roman)
Rome, Napoleon on, as the capital of Italy, 50; and the revolutionary movements of *1831*, 110, 111; declared a republic, 181; siege and capture of, by the French, 182; 223; not included in the new Italian Kingdom *(1861)*, 237; the question of, in the new Italian Kingdom, 238; and the Catholic Church, 238; seized by Italian troops and becomes the capital of the Kingdom of Italy *(1870)*, 301; President Loubet of France visits Victor Emmanuel III in, 368; and the question of the Papacy, 378-380; riots in *(1889)*, 383
Rome, King of (son of Napoleon I), 2, 127, 212. *See* Duke of Reichstadt
Romilly, statement in House of Commons concerning the Venetians, 10; and the Penal Code, 424
Roon, Albrecht von, Minister of War under William I, 249; at Königgrätz, 265
Roosevelt, Theodore, and the Treaty of Portsmouth *(1905)*, 702; and the Second Peace Conference at the Hague *(1907)*, 734
Root, Elihu, on the significance of the Peace Conferences at the Hague, 735
Rosebery, Lord, Ministry of, 510-511; and Lord Salisbury, 510
Rossi, murder of, 181
Rotten boroughs (England, *1815)*, 413-414
Roumania, 404; union of Moldavia and Wallachia into, 618; Alexander John I or Couza, Prince of, 618-619; reign of Charles I, 619-620; proclaims its independence, May 21, *1877*, 623; complete independence recognized by Treaty of San Stefano, *1878*, 624; declared independent by Congress of Berlin, *1878*, 625-626; forced to cede Bessarabia to Russia and to receive the Dobrudscha, 625-626; since *1878*, 632; proclaimed a kingdom, *1881*, 632; aspirations of, 635
Roumelia, Eastern, made a part of Bulgaria by the Treaty of San Stefano, *1878*, 624; disposition of, by the Congress of Berlin, *1878*, 625; union of, with Bulgaria, *1885*, 628
Roxburgh, 412
Royal Geographical Society sends Cameron to rescue Livingstone, 553
Royal Statute *(1834)*, Spain, 567
Rudini, Marquis di, Prime Minister *(1896)*, policy of pacification, 383
Rugby, 477
Rumania. *See* Roumania
Rumelia. *See* Roumelia
Russell, Lord John, created Earl Russell, *1861*, in the Grey Ministry, 430; introduces First Reform Bill in House of Commons, *1831*, 430; speech, 431; introduces Second Reform Bill, *1831*, 435; introduces Third Reform Bill, 436; on the question of further reform, 446; Prime Minister and the Reform Bill of *1866*, 462
Russia, Demands of, at the Congress of Vienna, 6; acquisitions of, 8; and the Second Treaty

Russia, *continued*
of Paris *(1815)*, 13; and the Holy Alliance, 14-16; signs Quadruple Alliance *(1815)*, 17; and the Congress of Troppau, 59; and the Congress of Verona, 62; prevented from acting in the Belgian affairs, 105; recognizes the Kingdom of Belgium, 105; and the revolution in Poland, 106-110; offers aid to Turkey against Mehemet Ali, 132; Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi *(1833)* with Turkey, 132; and the London Conference *(1840)*, 132; aids Austria against Hungary, 180; and the London Conference *(1864)*, 258; attitude of Bismarck toward *(1878)*, 320; alliance with France (Dual) *1891*, 357; growth of, 546; at the Conference of the Powers *(1876)*, 554; at the Congress of Berlin *(1884-1885)*, 555; and Finland, 595; and the Ottoman Empire, 601; and the Greek War of Independence, 606-609; and the Treaty of London *(1827)*, 609; battle of Navarino *(1827)*, 610; war with Turkey *(1828)*, 610-611; Treaty of Adrianople *(1829)*, 611; guarantees the independence of Greece, 611; and the Danubian Principalities, 611; ambitions of Nicholas I, 611-612; and the "holy places" in Palestine, 612; sends troops into Moldavia and Wallachia *(1853)*, 612; war with Turkey, 612; coalition against, 613; siege and fall of Sebastopol, 614-615, 654; Treaty of Paris, *1856*, 615-616; disregards neutrality of the Black Sea, recovers part of Bessarabia, 616; declares war against Turkey, *1877*, 623; allies of, 623; siege of Plevna, 623-624; Treaty of San Stefano, *1878*, 320, 624; by Congress of Berlin, *1878*, retains a part of Turkish Armenia and receives Bessarabia, 320, 626; influence of, in Bulgaria, 628; conspiracy against Alexander of Bulgaria, 630; attitude of, toward the breaches of the Berlin Treaty of *1878*, 629, 640; secret treaty with Austria, 640; reign of Alexander I, *1801-1825*, 645-650; Russia in *1815*, 645-646; Alexander I and Poland, 107, 647-648; Alexander's progressive domestic policy, 648; his liberal foreign policy, 649; Alexander becomes reactionary, 649; death of, 650; reign of Nicholas I, *1825-1855*, 650-655; system of repression by police and censorship, 651-652; literature under, 652-653; domestic policy, 653; foreign policy, 653-654; death of, 655; reign of Alexander II, *1855-1881*, accession and liberal tendencies of Alexander II, 655; prevailing system of land tenure, the mir and the serfs in, 655-657; Edict of Emancipation, *1861*, 657; the land problem, 657-660; establishment of the zemstvos, 660; reform of the judicial system, 661; Polish insurrection of *1863*, 662-663; Polish nobility crushed, 664; Russification of Poland, 665; Alexander becomes reactionary, 665; rise of Nihilism, 666-668; assassination of Alexander II, *1881*, 670; reign of Alexander III, *1881-1894*, 670-676; character and policy of, 670; influence of Pobyedonostseff, 670-671; persecution of the Jews, 672; policy of Russification, 672; progressive features of the reign, 673; industrial revolution, 673-674; Sergius de Witte appointed Minister of Finance *(1892)*, 674; policy of protection adopted, 674; railway construction, 675; rise of labor problems, 675; rise of a rich bourgeoisie, 675; system of privilege undermined, 676; death of Alexander III, *1894*, 676; Nicholas II, *1894*—, 676-680; accession and policy of repression, 676; increasing disaffection under, 677; condition of the peasantry, 677; persecution of the "intellectuals," 678; and Finland, 678-680; abrogates the Finnish constitution, 679; in Asia, 681; seeks access to the sea, 682; acquisitions from China *(1858-1860)*,

Russia, *continued*
682, 687; conquest of Turkestan, 682; intervenes with France and Germany in Japan, 696; gains entrance into Manchuria, 697; secures a lease of Port Arthur *(1898)*, 697; helps to rescue the legations in Peking, 698; activity of, in Manchuria, 699; diplomatic negotiations with, concerning Manchuria, 700; Russo-Japanese War, *1904-1905*, 701-702; siege of Port Arthur, 701; Mukden captured by the Japanese, 702; fleet of, destroyed by the Japanese, 702; signs Treaty of Portsmouth *(1905)*, 702-703; reaction of the Japanese war upon, 706; von Plehve's repressive policy in, 707; assassination of von Plehve, 707; Nicholas II enters upon a more liberal policy, 708; demands of the liberals in, not granted by the Tsar, 708-709; disorder in, 709; Decree of Dec., *1904*, 709-710; "Bloody Sunday" (January *22, 1905)*, 710; disorder in, 710; Manifesto of August 19, *1905*, 710-711; general strike (October, *1905)* in, 711; Manifesto of October 30, *1905*, 712; popular demand for a constitution refused, 712; Government of, makes concessions to Finland, 713; the Tsar constitutes the Council of the Empire, 713; the "organic laws" 713; Tsar opens the Duma, May 10, *1906*, 713; Tsar dissolves the Duma, July *22, 1906*, 715; the Second Duma, 715-716; Tsar alters the electoral system, 716; the Third Duma, 716; the transformation of the mir *(1909)*, 717; Tsar restores the liberties of Finland *(1905)*, 717; and Finland *(1909)*, 718
Russo-Japanese War, 701-702

Sadler, Thomas, and the child labor agitation, 442
Sadowa or Königgrätz, battle of, between Prussia and Austria *(1866)*, 265, 478; importance of, to France, 288
Sagasta, leader of the Spanish Liberals, *1876*, 573
Saghalin, Island of, Russia cedes to Japan the southern half of, 703
St. Croix, 594
St. John, 594
St. Louis, on west coast of Africa, French possession, 373
St. Lucia, retained by England in *1815*, 9, 519
St. Petersburg, revolt in *(1825)*, 650; attempts to kill Tsar Alexander II at, 669; population of, 675; resolution of the Institute of Mining Engineers at, on the war with Japan, 706; representatives of the zemstvos meet at *(1904)*, 708; students in, revolt, 709; "Bloody Sunday" (January *22, 1905)* in, 710; electorate in, 711
St. Pierre, French possession, *1815*, 371
St. Simon, and socialism, 138
St. Thomas, 594
Salisbury, Lord, leader of the Conservatives, *1881-1902*, 497, First Ministry, *1885*, 497; opposition of, to the Irish Home Rule and Land Bills, 503; Second Ministry, *1886-1892*, 505-507; policy of coercion for Ireland, 505; Land Purchase Act of *1891* passed, 505-506; County Councils Act of *1888*, 506; Social Legislation, 506-507; increase of the navy, *1889*, 507; and the Second Home Rule Bill, 509; and the House of Lords, 509-510; and Lord Rosebery, 510; Third Ministry, *1895-1902*, 511-515; assumes the Foreign Office, 511
Salmeron, 572
Salzburg, 8
Samara, 677
Samarkand, 682
Samoan Islands, 319
Samurai, The, 689, 693
San Domingo, 569
San Marino, 52
San Stefano, Treaty of, *1878*, 624; opposition to, 624-625; England demands revision of, 625
Sand, Karl, assassin of Kotzebue, 40
Sand River Convention, *1852*, 538; Morley on, 540
Santiago, battle of, 574

Saragossa, 49
Sardinia, Island of, Victor Emmanuel I flees to, 5, 51, 54; Kingdom of, *see* Piedmont
Saskatchewan, admitted to the Dominion of Canada, *1905*, 529
Savona, Mazzini imprisoned at, 161
Savoy, part of, added to France by Treaty of Paris *(1814)*, 3; House of, 182, 215, 221, 378; agreement at Plombières concerning, 223; annexation of, to France *(1860)*, 231; Amadeo of, 570-571
Saxe-Coburg, Albert of, Prince Consort, 445; Ferdinand of, elected Prince of Bulgaria, 630
Saxe-Weimar, 37
Salonika, 642; the deposed Sultan Abdul Hamid II, taken as a prisoner of state to, 643
Saxony, King of, restored *(1815)*, 8; cessions of, to Prussia at Congress of Vienna, 8; position in the Diet, 30; government in *1815*, 36; revolutionary movements in *(1830)*, 112; supports Austria in the war of *1866*, 263; in the North German Confederation, 268, 269
Scandinavian States, The, 592-600
Schaumburg-Lippe, 304
Scheurer-Kestner, and the Dreyfus Case, 360
Schleiermacher, 44
Schleswig-Holstein, question of, 256-259; Schleswig incorporated with Denmark, 257; Danish war concerning, 258; all rights to, renounced by Denmark in favor of Austria and Prusssia by the Treaty of Vienna *(1864)*, 259; Convention of Gastein *(1865)*, 259-260; Austria brings question of, before the Diet, 263; incorporated in the Kingdom of Prussia, 267; Frederick VI and, 592; Frederick VII and, 593
School boards, England, 479, 514
Schopenhauer, 246
Schwarzenberg, Austrian Minister, 179
Schwarzhoff, General von, address at the First Peace Conference at the Hague *(1899)*, 731
Science, in the nineteenth century, 720-721
Scotland, Representation of, in House of Commons, *1815*, 410; condition in the counties of, in *1815*, 412; given increased representation, 437; Act of *1833* correcting abuses in municipal government in, 444; Reform Bill, *1868*, for, 464; Franchise Bill, 493; Gladstonian vote in, *1886*, 504; County Councils Act of *1889*, 506; Old Age Pensions Law in, 516
Sebastopol, Siege of, 614; fall of, 615, 654
Second Empire, The Transformation of, 272-284
Second French Republic and the Founding of the Second Empire, The, 187-214
Seeley, Sir John Robert, in his *"Expansion of England"* on the government of India, 522
Senegal, French possession *1815*, 371; Valley, annexed to France under Napoleon III, 373, 374
Separation of Church and State in France, 364-371
September Laws *(1835)*, 125-127
Septennate, Establishment of the, 343
Seven Weeks' or Austro-German War *(1866)*, 263-267
Serfs, Emancipation of, in Russia *(1861)*, 657
Sergius, Grand Duke, assassinated, 710
Serrano, Marshal, 569; Regency of, 570; and the Spanish Republic, 572
Servia, Kingdom of, 404; revolt of the Servians, 604; becomes autonomous principality tributary to the Sultan, 604, 609; Slavs of, aid Herzegovina, *1875*, 620; and Montenegro declare war against Turkey, *1876*, 622-623; complete independence of, recognized by the Treaty of San Stefano, *1878*, 624; opposition to the Treaty of San Stefano, *1878*, 624-625; declared independent by Congress of Berlin, *1878*, 625-626; attacks Bulgaria, *1885*, 629; Treaty of Bucharest, *1886*, 629; since *1878*, 633; Kingdom proclaimed, *1882*, 633; aspirations of, 635; protests against Austria-Hun-

Servia, *continued*
gary's annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, 639; *(1909)*, 641-642
Seville, 565
Shanghai, opened to British trade by Treaty of Nanking *(1842)*, 685
Shantung, Germany establishes a "sphere of influence" in *(1898)*, 697
Sheffield, unrepresented in Parliament *(1815)*, 414
Shimonoseki, Treaty of *(1895)*, 695-696
Shogun, The, 688-689; breaks policy of isolation, 690-691; overthrow of the Shogunate, 691; abolition of the Shogunate, 692
Siberia, 109, 646, 651, 652, 653, 656, 668, 669, 681, 682, 707, 713
Sibir, 681
Sicilies, The Kingdom of the Two. *See* Naples
Sicily, 51, 62; conquest of, by Garibaldi, 234-235; illiteracy in, *1861*, 381; emigration from, 386
Sickness Insurance Law *(1883)* in Germany, 316
Silesia, 23
Simon Ministry dismissed, 349
Six Acts or Gag Laws, England *(1819)*, 422
Slavery, abolished in the French colonies, 190; abolition of, in British Empire, decreed by Law of *1833*, 440; abolished in British South Africa, *1834*, 537
Slave-trade, denounced at the Congress of Vienna *(1815)*, 12; abolished by England, *1807*, 439
Slavonia, 177, 396
Slavs, 25, 154, 177; attitude toward Austria in the Austro-Prussian War of *1866*, 266; favored by Taaffe Ministry, 400; 404; 405
Slovenes, demands of, 397; in Carniola, Slavicize the province, 400
Smith, Adam, author of "*Wealth of Nations*," *1776*, 417
Smith, Sidney, on the Irish Church, 471
Sobranje, elects Ferdinand of Saxe-Coburg, Prince of Bulgaria, 630
Social Democratic Party (Germany), 325
Social Legislation, in Germany, 315-316; in Austria, 400; in England, 459, 506-507, 515-516; in New Zealand, 535-536; in Denmark, 594
Socialism, in France, under Louis Philippe, 138; Louis Blanc and, 138, his theories, 189; under the Provisional Government, 188; National Workshops, 191-194; growth of, under Napoleon III, 331-332; in Germany, 312-318, 324-325; in Austria, 400-402; in England, 458; Bakounine and, 667; in Russia, 667-668, 675, 707
Sofia, capital of Bulgaria, 631
Solferino, battle of, 225, 226, 725
Solovief, attempt of, upon the life of Alexander II, *1879*, 669
Somaliland, Italian protectorate established over, 382
Sonderbund *(1847)*, 586
Soudan, Egypt loses, 561; recovery of, 562; Turkey and, 643
Soult, minister of Louis Philippe, 131
South Africa. *See* British South Africa
South Africa, Union of, *1909*, 544-545, 549
South African Republic. *See* Transvaal
South America, 48; Monroe Doctrine and, 64-65; Garibaldi in, 232; Guiana in, a French possession, *1815*, 371; Italian emigration to, 386; revolts in, 565, 574
South Australia, responsible government granted to, 527; in the Australian Commonwealth, 532
Spa Fields, 420
Spain, Reaction and Revolution in, 45-50; Constitution of *1812*, 45-46; restoration of Ferdinand VII, 46; condition of, in *1815*, 47-48; disintegration of the Spanish Empire, 48-49; Revolution of *1820*, 49-50; proclamation of Constitution of *1812*, 50; and the Congress of Verona, 62; invasion of the French, 63; siege of Cadiz, 63; reaction in, 63; England prohibits the conquest of Spanish-American colonies by France and allies, 64-65; joint intervention with England and France in Mexico, 277, 569; revo-

Spain, *continued*
lution of *1868* and candidacy of Leopold of Hohenzollern, 290-291; stations of, in Africa, *1815*, 551; and Portugal, 564-578; Spain since *1823*, 564-575; revenge of King Ferdinand VII in, after *1823*, 564; loses the American colonies, 565; and the Pragmatic Sanction, 565-566; death of Ferdinand VII and accession of Isabella, 566; the Carlist war, 566-567; Christina as Regent grants the Royal Statute of *1834*, 567; disturbed political life in, *1833-1858*, 568; Constitution of *1837*, 568; Queen Regent driven into exile, Isabella II declared of age, 568; overthrow of Isabella II, and establishment of a provisional government, 569; regency of Marshal Serrano, 570; Amadeo of Savoy chosen king, 570; abdication of Amadeo, 571; establishment of the Republic, *1873-1874*, 571-572; causes of its fall, 572; Alfonso XII recognized as king, *1874*, 572; the Constitution of *1876*, 573; death of Alfonso XII and regency of Queen Maria Christina, 574; Cuban War, *1868-1878*, *1895*, 574; Spanish-American War, *1898*, 574; Treaty of Paris, *1898*, Spain renounces Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines, 574; possessions in *1898*, 574; Alfonso XIII assumes power in *(1902)*, 576; Alexander I (Russia) and, 649
Spanish-American Colonies, England and, 64-65; Spain loses, 565, 574
Spanish-American War *(1898)*, 574
Speke, English explorer, finds one source of the Nile, 552
Spicheren, Germans defeat French at, 296
Staal, M. de, President of the First Peace Conference at the Hague, Address of, 730-731
Stambuloff, Dictatorship of, 630-631; murder of, 631
Standard, The, 419
Stanley, Henry M., explorations of the Congo River system, 553; as organizer in the Congo, *1879-1884*, 555
Stanley, later Lord Derby, in the Grey Ministry, 430; on the Reform Bill, 434
State Insurance, in Germany, 315-316; in Austria, 400; in England, 459, 515-516; in New Zealand, 535-536; in Denmark, 594
State Socialism in Germany, 315-316. *See also* State Insurance and Social Legislation
Staten Island, Garibaldi at, 233
States of the Church. *See* Papal States
Steam, engine, 407; age of, 721; navigation, 723-724; locomotive, 724-725
Stein, Baron vom, 43, 139
Stephen, Sir Leslie, on preferment in the Established Church, 416
Stephens, James, leader of the Fenian movement in Ireland, 470
Stephenson, George, and steam locomotives, 725
Stepniak, on Nihilism, 666
Stockholm, capital of Sweden, 596
Stolypin, Prime Minister, 715, 716; and the transformation of the mir, 717
Storthing (Norway) established *(1814)*, 595, 596, 598
Strassburg, Louis Philippe at, 128, 199; surrender of *(1870)*, 299
Strike, The resort to the general, in Russia, 711-712
Suez Canal, purchase of shares of, by England, 488; Ismail and, 558
Sumatra, 581
Surinam, 581
Sviatopolk Mirski, Prince, Russian Minister of Home Affairs, 708, 710
Sweden, loses Pomerania by the Congress of Vienna, 8; acquires Norway by Treaty of Kiel *(1814)*, 10, 592, 595; Russia acquires Finland from, 595, 645; war with Norway, 595-596; Union with Norway, 596; Constitution of *1866*, 597; friction with Norway, 597-598; dissolution of the Union with Norway and Treaty of Carlstad *(1905)*, 599; death of Oscar II, and accession of Gustavus V *(1907)*, 600; Franchise Reform Bill of *1909*, 600.

Switzerland, territorial acquisitions of, by Congress of Vienna, 10; influence of the July Revolution *(1830)* in, 100; attitude of, toward the Spanish Republic, 572; condition of *(1815)*, 584; Pact of *1815*, 12, 584; importance of the cantons in, 584-585; "era of regeneration," *1830-1847*, 585; the Sonderbund, 586; Constitution of *1848*, 586-587; the chief significance of, 587; important contributions to democratic government, 588-590; the Landesgemeinde cantons, 588; the referendum, 588-589; the initiative, 589; spread of the referendum and the initiative, 590; proportional representation, 590; population of, 590; neutrality of, 591
Sybel, von, estimate of the German Act of Confederation, 32; on German unity, 34; 246
Sydney, 531
Syria, Mehemet Ali, in, 131, 558; part of the Ottoman Empire, *1815*, 601
Széchenyi, Count Stephen, reforms of, in Hungary, 156

Taaffe Ministry, *1879-1893*, 400; fall of, 401
Talienwan, 697
Talleyrand, at Congress of Vienna, 4; forms secret alliance between England, Austria, and France (January, *1815*), 7
Tanganyika, Lake, 552
Tashkend, 682
Tasmania, responsible government granted to, 527; in the Australian Commonwealth, 532
Telegraph, 726
Telegraph Union, International, 591
Tel-el-Kebir, Wolseley defeats Arabi at, 559
Telephone, invented by Alexander Graham Bell *(1876)*, 726
Temple, Cowper-Temple amendment to Forster Education Act of *1870*, 480
Terra Australis, 530
Terror, The White, 73-74
Terrorism (Russia), 668, 671
Test Act, Repeal of *(1828)*, 425
Tests (religious), in English Universities abolished *(1871)*, 483
Tewfik, Khedive of Egypt, *1879-1892*, revolt of Arabi Pasha, 559
Thessaly, the Powers recommend the cession of, to Greece *(1878)*, 626; Sultan cedes, to Greece *(1881)*, 634; Greece loses parts of *(1897)*, 635
Thiers, protests against the edicts of Charles X, 94; Manifesto in favor of Louis Philippe, 96; rivalry of Guizot and, 130; Ministry of, 131-132; on railroads, 211; opposes war against Prussia, 293; elected "Chief of the Executive Power" by the National Assembly at Bordeaux, arranges terms of peace with Bismarck at Versailles, 300; government forces withdrawn from Paris by, 333; attitude toward the Commune, 334; government of, 336-342; and the Rivet Law, 337; policy of, 337-338; and the liberation of the territory, 338; reform in local government, 339; army reform, 339; and the Republic, 340-341; outvoted in the Assembly and resigns *(1873)*, 341-342
Third Section, part of the Russian police system, 651, 669, 671-672
Three F's, The, 491
Thuringian Duchies, join Zollverein, 148.
Tientsin, Treaties of, *1858*, 686, confirmed, *1860*, 687
Tithe War, Ireland, 472
Tobago, retained by England in *1815*, 9, 519
Tocqueville, de, on the French Revolution of *1848*, 187
Todleben, at Sebastopol, 614; at siege of Plevna, 623
Togo, Admiral, destroys the Russian fleet *(1905)*, 702
Togoland, German colony in Africa, 319
Tokio, capital of Japan, 692, 693; University established at, 693
Tonkin, France sends expedition to, 353; failure of the war in, 355; annexed *(1885)*, 374
Toulouse, speech of Waldeck-Rousseau at, on the question of Church and State *(1900)*, 364-366

Tours, branch seat of the French government during the siege of Paris, 298
Trades Unions, in England, growth of, 457
Trans-Caspian railroad, 682
Transformation of the Second Empire, The, 272-284
Transleithania, 395. *See* Hungary
Trans-Siberian railroad, 675, 696, 699, 701; Russia extends, to Vladivostok, 697
Transvaal, The, founding of, 538; independence of, acknowledged by Great Britain, *1852*, 538; annexed to the British Empire, *1877*, 538; Majuba Hill, 539; and the Pretoria Convention, *1881*, 540; and the London Convention, *1884*, 540; discovery of gold, *1884*, 541; Jameson Raid, *1895*, 541-542; Sir Alfred Milner's Reports on, *1899*, 542; and the South African War, 543-544; annexed to the British Empire, *1902*, 544. *See* Transvaal Colony
Transvaal Colony, responsible government granted to, *1906*, 528, 544; position of, in the Union of South Africa *(1909)*, 544-545.
Transylvania, a part of Hungary, 24; allowed a certain measure of autonomy, 155; severed from Hungary, 388; position of, in the Empire *(1861)*, 390, 392, 396; demands of the Roumanians in, 403
Treaties, Kiel *(1814)*, Denmark and Sweden, 592; (First) Paris *(1814)*, France and the Allies, 3, 5; (Secret) Treaty of Defensive Triple Alliance concluded at the Congress of Vienna *(1815)*, France, England, and Austria against Russia and Prussia, 7; (Second) Paris *(1815)*, Louis XVIII and the Allies, 13; Holy Alliance *(1815)*, Russia and the Powers, 14; Quadruple Alliance *(1815)*, Russia, Prussia, Austria, and England, 16-17; London *(1827)*, England, Russia, and France on the question of Greece, 609; Adrianople *(1829)*, Russia and Turkey, 611; London *(1830-1831)*, recognizes the Kingdom of Belgium, 105; Unkiar Skelessi *(1833)*, Russia and Turkey, 132; London *(1840)*, England, Russia, Austria, and Prussia on the Eastern Question, 132; Nanking *(1842)*, England and China, 685; *(1844)* United States and China (Commercial), 686; London Protocol *(1852)*, concerning Schleswig-Holstein, 257-258; *(1854)* United States and Japan (Commercial), 691; Paris *(1856)*, England, France, Austria, Russia, Prussia, Sardinia, and Turkey, 615-616; Tientsin *(1858)*, England and China, France and China, 686, confirmed *(1860)*, 687; Zurich *(1859)* (Preliminaries at Villafranca, 225-226), Austria, France, and Sardinia, 228; Turin *(1860)*, France and Sardinia, 231; *1860*, Treaty of Commerce, France and England, 274; London *(1861)*, England, Spain, and France agree to joint intervention in Mexico, 277; Vienna *(1864)*, Denmark, Austria, and Prussia, 259, 593; Gastein *(1865)*, Prussia and Austria, 259-260; Alliance *(1866)*, Prussia and Italy, 261; Prague *(1866)*, Prussia and Austria (Preliminary at Nikolsburg), 263, 266-268; Versailles and Frankfort *(1871)*, Germany and France, 300-301, 338; Berlin Memorandum *(1876)*, 620; San Stefano *(1878)*, Russia and Turkey, 624; Berlin *(1878)*, 625-626; Austro-German *(1879)*, 321; Triple Alliance, Germany, Austria, and Italy *(1882)*, 319-321, 382; Berlin *(1884-1885)*, concerning Congo Free State, 555-556; Bucharest *(1886)*, Bulgaria and Servia, 629; Dual Alliance *(1891)*, France and Russia, 357; Shimonoseki *(1895)*, China and Japan, 695-696; Paris *(1898)*, Spain and the United States, 574; Anglo-Japanese *(1902)*, 700; Carlstad *(1905)*, Sweden and Norway, 599-600; Portsmouth *(1905)*, Russia and Japan, 702-703
Treaty ports (China), 685
Treitschke, 149, 246

Trevelyan, Sir George, on the policy of coercion in Ireland, 505
Tribune (The), prosecution of, under the July Monarchy, 124
Trinidad, retained by England in *1815*, 9, 519
Trinity College (Dublin), 484
Triple Alliance, *1882*, 319-322, 357, 382, 640
Tripoli, one of the Barbary States, 372; in *1815*, 551
Tripolitza, taken by the Greeks, 606
Trocadero, 63
Trochu, General, Head of the Government of National Defense, 297
Troppau, Congress of *(1820)*, 59-60
Tsushima, Straits of, naval battle of the, *1905*, 702
Tunis, seized by France, *1881*, 321; France establishes a protectorate over *(1881)*, 353, 374, 554; Picquart sent to, 359; one of the Barbary States, 372; in *1815*, 551, 602
Turgenieff, 652; definition of a Nihilist, 666
Turin, 54, 61; parliament meets at, 230, 237; Treaty of *(1860)*, 231; capital of Italy to *1865*, 378; riots in *(1889)*, 383
Turkestan, conquest of, by Russia *(1845-1885)*, 682
Turkey, war with Mehemet Ali, 131; interference of Russia in, and Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi *(1833)*, 132; England comes to the aid of, 132; London Conference *(1840)*, 132; protects Kossuth and other Hungarian leaders, 180; war in the Crimea, 219, 654; loss of Algeria, 372-373; Austria-Hungary and, 405; question of the integrity of *(1876)*, 489; position of, in Africa, *1815*, 551; relation of Egypt to, 557; decay of the Ottoman Empire, 601; the ruling class in, 602; the Eastern Question, 602; treatment of subject peoples, 603; revolt of the Servians, 604; Servia becomes an autonomous principality tributary to the Sultan, 604; and the Greek War of Independence, 604-611; calls upon Mehemet Ali, of Egypt, for aid, 607; foreign intervention, 607-610; battle of Navarino, *1827*, 610; war with Russia, *1827-1828*, 610, 654; Treaty of Adrianople, *1829*, 611; Greece becomes a kingdom, 611; and the "holy places" in Palestine, 612; war with Russia, 612-616; Treaty of Paris, *1856*, 615; admitted to the European Concert, 616; from the Treaty of Paris to the Treaty of Berlin, 617-627; union of the Danubian Principalities into Roumania, *1862*, 618; insurrection of Herzegovina, *1875*, 620; Berlin Memorandum, *1876*, 620; accession of Abdul Hamid II, 621; the Bulgarian atrocities, *1876*, 621-622; Servia and Montenegro declare war, 622-623; Russia declares war, *1877*, 623; siege of Plevna, 623; Treaty of San Stefano, *1878*, 624; Congress of Berlin, *1878*, revises Treaty of San Stefano, 625-626; union of the two Bulgarias, 626; Greece declares war against *(1897)*, 635; revolution in, 636-644; Revolution of July, *1908*, 636; restoration of the Constitution of *1876*, 637; aims of the Young Turks, 637-638; Bulgaria declares its independence, October 5, *1908*, 631, 639; attitude of foreign Powers, 638-640; Austria-Hungary annexes Bosnia and Herzegovina, *1908*, 639; declares in favor of peace, 641; Austria-Hungary and Bulgaria negotiate with, *(1908)*, 641; opening of the Turkish Parliament *(1908)*, 642; counter-revolution of April, *1909*, 642; the Young Turks regain control and depose the Sultan Abdul Hamid II, 642-643; accession of Mohammed V, *1909*, 643. *See* The Disruption of the Ottoman Empire and the Rise of the Balkan States, 601-644
Tuscany, the dominance of Austria in, 9, 52-53; reforms in, 167; coöperates in insurrection against Austria, 173; recalls troops, 175; declared a republic, 181; restoration of the Grand Duke of, 182;

Tuscany, *continued*
reaction in, after *1848*, 215; agreement at Plombières concerning, 223; restoration of the Grand Duke of, 226; annexed to Piedmont *(1860)*, 230; government of, 377
Tyrol, The, 8

Uitlanders, and the Boers, 541
Ulster System, "tenant right" of land tenure, 475
Ultras, The (France, *1815)*, 72; Louis XVIII checks, 74-75; activity of, 78; triumph of, 82
Umbria, 235; annexation of, to Piedmont, 236
Union, Act of, *1800*, 497
Union of South Africa *(1909)*, 544-545, 549
United Landtag, of Prussia, 151; conflict between Frederick William IV and, 152
United States, coöperate with England to prevent the conquest of the Spanish-American colonies by the Holy Alliance, 64-65; the Monroe Doctrine in, 64-65; German emigration to, 241; and the Mexican Expedition, 277; intervention of, in Mexico, 279; Bismarck on the policy of protection in, 311; Italian emigration to, 386; effect on England of the Civil War in, 461; Irish emigration to, 470; and the Alabama award, 486, 591; and the Oregon dispute *(1846)*, 529; growth of, 547; at Congress of Berlin *(1884-1885)*, 555; demand reforms in the Congo, 557; recognize the Republic of Spain, 572; Spanish-American War *(1898)*, 574; Jewish emigration to, 672; send Caleb Cushing to make a commercial treaty with China *(1844)*, 686; send Commodore Perry to Japan *(1853)*, 690; Treaty of, with Japan *(1854)*, 691; help to rescue the legations in Peking, 698; diplomatic negotiations of, with Russia concerning Manchuria, 700; Russo-Japanese Treaty at Portsmouth, New Hampshire, *1905*, 702-703
Universities, ferment in German, 39; control of German, under Metternich, 41-42; in Prague, 400; representation of, in Great Britain, 412, *note;* religious tests of, in Great Britain abolished, 483; in Ireland by the Birrell Act *(1908)*, 516; State, founded in Belgium, 582; in Greece, 634; in Japan, 693
Unkiar Skelessi, Treaty of *(1833)*, 132

Valais, 585
Valençay, 47
Vatican, 379
Vaud, 585
Venetia, disposition of, by First Treaty of Paris *(1814)*, 3; disposition of, by Peace of Villafranca, 226; not included in the new Kingdom of Italy *(1861)*, 237; ceded to Italy by Austria *(1866)*, 267, 376
Venice, 52; the leading city of Venetia, 172; declares itself a republic, 173; fall of *(1849)*, 182
Verona, Congress of, 62-63; fortress of, 173
Versailles, armistice of *(1871)*, 299; peace of, 300-301; declared the capital *(1871)*, 330; war between Paris and the Government of, 333-336; capital transferred from *(1880)*, 352
Viborg Manifesto *(1906)*, 715
Victor Emmanuel I, King of Sardinia, government of, 54-55; abdicates, 61
Victor Emmanuel II, succeeds his father as King of Sardinia, 181; accession and character, 216; and the interview at Plombières, 222-223; attitude of, toward the Preliminaries of Villafranca, 227; accepts the sovereignty of Modena, Parma, Tuscany, and the Romagna, 230; advances with his army into the Kingdom of Naples, 236; and Garibaldi, 237; all Italy (excepting Rome and Venetia) united under his sovereignty *(1861)*, 237; allied with Prussia in war against Austria *(1866)*, 261; gains Venetia, 267; neutrality of, in Franco-German War, 294; takes possession of Rome, 301; programme of *(1870)*, 377; and

Victor Emmanuel II, *continued* the Papacy, 378-379; death of *(1878)*, 380
Victor Emmanuel III, King of Italy, *1900—*, succeeds his father, Humbert I, 384; visited by President Loubet, of France *(1904)*, 368; character of, 384; industrial expansion under, 385; increase of population under, 386; and the problem of emigration under, 386; and the monarchy in Italy, 387
Victoria (British colony), and the secret ballot, 484; responsible government granted to, *527*; in the Australian Commonwealth, *532*; legislation of, 536
Victoria, Queen of England, *1837-1901*, accession and political education, 445; marriage to Prince Albert of Saxe-Coburg, *1840*, 445; and Hanover, 446; abolishes purchase in the army by royal ordinance, *1871*, 482; proclaimed Empress of India *(1877)*, 489, *522*; death of, 513
Victoria Nyanza, *552*
Vienna, *see* Congress of Vienna; center of European affairs, *1815-1848*, 28; Conference of *(1820)*, 44; industrial revolution in, 153; storm center of *1848*, 169; riots in *(1848)*, 170; Bohemian delegation sent to, 172; outbreak in, 178; Treaty of *(1864)*, 259, 593; Hungary governed from, 388; and the Delegations, 394; capital of Austria, 395, 397
Világos, Capitulation of, 180
Villafranca, Preliminaries of *(1859)*, *225-226*; annexations after, *228-232*
Villèle, Ministry of *(1822-1828)*, 82, 88; fall of, 89
Villemain, 89
Villiers, and the Anti-Corn-Law League, *452*
Vinogradoff, on the government of Russia and the condition of the peasantry *(1902)*, 677
Virchow, 246
Vladivostok, founded by Russia as a naval base, *1860*, 682, 687; Russia secures the right to extend her Trans-Siberian railroad to, 697; Russian fleet at, 701; Japan defeats the fleet of, 702
Volta, 385
Vorparlament, 174

Waldeck, 327
Waldeck-Rousseau, leader of the "Bloc," 364; Prime Minister *(1900-1902)*, speech at Toulouse concerning the question of Church and State, 365; and the Law of Associations, July 1, *1901*, 366
Wales, representation of, in House of Commons, *1815*, 410; Gladstonian vote in, *1886*, 504; County Councils Act of *1888*, 506; Old Age Pensions Law in, 516
Wallachia, part of the Ottoman Empire *(1815)*, 601. *See* Danubian Principalities.
Wallon Amendment, 345
Walpole, Sir Spencer, on the English inventors, 408 and *note*; on the elections of *1793*, 413; on the death penalty for offenses, 423, *note;* on Postal Savings Banks, 459; on Australia, 530
Warsaw, Grand Duchy of, *5*; demanded by Russia at Congress of Vienna, 6; division of, 8; becomes Kingdom of Poland, 647. *See* Poland.
Warsaw, Grand Duke driven from, 108; fall of, 109; capital of Poland, 647, 663
Wartburg Festival, 39-40, 112
Waterloo, 13, 129, 145, 170, 207, 406, 418
Watt, James, and the steam engine, 407, 721
"*Wealth of Nations,*" by Adam Smith, 417
"*Weekly Political Register, The,*" published by Cobbett, 419
Wellington, capital of New Zealand, 534
Wellington, Duke of, 408; and the Catholic Emancipation Act *(1829)*, 427, 428; on parliamentary reform, 429; ministry of, put out of office, 430; asked to form a ministry, fails, 436; and the Chartist agitation in London, 449
West Indies, French possessions in, 371; slavery in the English

West Indies, *continued*
colonies of, and its abolition, 439-440; English possessions in, 519; Dutch possessions in, 581; Danish possessions in, 594
Western Africa, 374
Western Australia, responsible government granted to, *1890*, 528; in the Australian Commonwealth, 532
Westminster Abbey, Gladstone buried in *(1898)*, 510; Livingstone buried in, 553
Wet, Christian de, in the South African War, 543
Wetherell, Sir C., speech against the Reform Bill, 433; on Second Reform Bill, 435
Weyler, 574
White Terror, The (France), 73-74
Wilberforce, and the anti-slavery agitation, 440
Wilhelmina, Queen of Holland, *1890—*, 579
William I, King of Holland, *1814-1840*, 102, 104; promulgates the Fundamental Law of *1815*, 579
William II., King of Holland, *1840-1849*, 579; and the Constitution of *1848*, 580
William III, King of Holland, *1849-1890*, 579; extension of the suffrage, *1887*, 581
William I, King of Prussia, *1861-1888*, German Emperor, *1871-1888*, becomes Regent *(1858)*, 247; succeeds his brother Frederick William IV, 247; characterization of, 248; and army reform *(1860)*, 249-250; appoints Bismarck President of the Ministry, 250; and the Danish War, 258; alliance with Italy against Austria, 261; at Königgrätz, 265; becomes President of the North German Confederation, 269; alliance with the South German States, 270; interview of, with Benedetti at Ems on the candidacy of Prince Leopold to the Spanish throne, 292; becomes German Emperor, 301; his powers as Emperor, 303-304; Emperor, *1871-1888*, 305; and the Roman Catholic Church, 305-310; and Socialism, 313, 315; attempts upon the life of, 313; alliance of the Three Emperors, 320; death of, 322
William II, King of Prussia and German Emperor, *1888—*, accession and character of, 322; demands resignation of Bismarck *(1890)*, 323; policy of, since *1890*, 323; his chancellors, 323; anti-Socialist policy abandoned, 323; expansion of German industry and commerce under, 324; and the navy, 324; interview with, published in the London *Telegraph*, October 28, *1908*, and demand for ministerial responsibility, 327
William IV, King of England, *1830-1837*, accession of, 428; and the Third Reform Bill, 436; death of, 445
Wilson, son-in-law of President Grévy, 355
Windischgrätz, commander of the troops in Prague, 175; conquers Vienna, 178
Witte, Sergius de, Minister of Finance and Commerce *(1892)*, policy of, 674-676; appointed Prime Minister *(1905)*, 712; resigns, 713; and the transformation of the mir *(1909)*, 717
Wolseley, General, in Egypt, 559
Woman Suffrage, in England, Mill's speech in favor of, 464; present status of, 516-517; in New Zealand, 536; in Denmark, 594; in Norway, 600; in Finland, 718
Wörth, battle of, 296
Würtemberg, King of, at Congress of Vienna, 4; position in the Diet, 29-30; granted a constitution *(1819)*, 37; supports Austria in the War of *1866*, 263; joins Prussia in the Franco-Prussian war *(1870)*, 294; becomes part of the German Empire, 301

Yalu, battle of the, 695, 701
Yedo, 689; Mikado establishes the government at, 692; becomes Tokio, 692
Yokohama, 693

Yorkshire, gain in House of Commons by Redistribution Act of *1885*, 494
Young Italy, Society of, 161-163, 232
Young Turks, 636-644

Zambesi River, Livingstone traces the course of, 552
Zemstvos, established by Alexander II *(1864)*, 660; restricted by Alexander III, 671; Prince Sviatopolk Mirski and, 708
Zola, Émile, and the Dreyfus Case, 360-363; body of, transferred to the Pantheon *(1908)*, 363
Zollverein, 148; advantages of, 149
Zurich, Peace of *(1859)*, 228, 389; Diet at, 584; constitution of the canton of, on the initiative and the referendum, 589

Date Due

OCT 3 1947			
OCT 31 1947			
MAR 28			
JUL 21 1949			
FEB 28			
MAR 21 '50			
OCT 26 1954			
7.31.'62			
MAY 11 1973			
MAR 23 1979			

Library Bureau Cat. no. 1137

ST. THOMAS COLLEGE
LIBRARY
WITHDRAWN
UST

Hazen, C. D. 6292
cop. 2
Europe since 1815